SERIE ORIENTALE ROMA

VIII

E. FRAUWALLNER

THE EARLIEST VINAYA AND THE BEGINNINGS OF BUDDHIST LITERATURE

ROMA

Is. M. E. O.

1956

THE EARLIEST VINAYA AND THE BEGINNINGS OF BUDDHIST LITERATURE

ISTITUTO ITALIANO PER IL MEDIO
ED ESTREMO ORIENTE

SERIE ORIENTALE ROMA

SOTTO LA DIREZIONE
DI
GIUSEPPE TUCCI

VOLUME VIII

ROMA
Is. M. E. O.
1956

SERIE ORIENTALE ROMA

VIII

E. FRAUWALLNER

THE EARLIEST VINAYA AND THE BEGINNINGS OF BUDDHIST LITERATURE

ROMA
Is. M. E. O.
1956

TUTTI I DIRITTI RISERVATI

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Printed in Italy – Stampato in Italia

DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY

OF SYLVAIN LEVI

PREFACE

> In science many things become certain, provided one does not allow himself to be led astray by exceptions and is able to respect problems.
>
> (GOETHE)

The present work is the outcome of a cursory study of Buddhist Vinaya texts. It outlines perhaps more problems than it can solve. If in spite of this I now send it to the press, it is because I think that the importance of the results obtained warrants my decision. If these results are confirmed, we shall gain through them a basis from which it appears possible to grapple the central problems of the earliest Buddhist literature with a greater chance of success than heretofore.

I have attempted to bring nearer to a solution a fundamental problem in the history of the Buddhist Vinaya. The threads issuing from it run in manifold directions; to follow them all would require many years, and my activity is bound by other tasks. Still, I think that several important results have been secured. The mass of the material has been worked through and prepared for further research. Through the determination of a Vinaya text belonging to the first half of the 4th century B. C. we have obtained a firm point for the history of the earliest Buddhist literature. At the same time some light has been thrown on the literature of that period. The development of the biography of the Buddha has been clarified in an essential point. Lastly, we have found

a starting point for a criticism of the origin of Buddhist church history and its historical value. I shall be glad if these results will meet with the approval of fellow workers in the field, and above all if they will stimulate them to further successful research.

I am deeply obliged to Professor G. Tucci, who accepted my work for his valuable Serie Orientale Roma and made thus its early publication possible. I wish to express my heartfelt thanks for this, as well as for the friendly interest which he has always taken in my work.

Lastly, I may add some words about the dedication of this work. I have studied at a university, where Indology had been neglected for a long time and was limited to a most narrow circle of subjects. When later I went my own ways and became acquainted with the work of Sylvain Lévi and his school, it was for me like the revelation of a new world and I received from it a large amount of stimulation. I had no occasion to meet Sylvain Lévi personally, but I have continuously learnt and am still learning from him. This book too is in a large measure based upon his and his pupils' works. And even if I have gone my own ways, yet I owe to his stimulating researches more than the references in the notes appear to reveal. The dedication of this work to his memory means for me, therefore, the payment of a great debt of gratitude.

Vienna, November 15th, 1953.

E. FRAUWALLNER.

ABBREVIATIONS:

BEFEO = Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême Orient.
IHQ = Indian Historical Quarterly.
JAs = Journal Asiatique.
ZDMG = Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.

Works frequently quoted:

LAMOTTE, *Traité* = Et. LAMOTTE, *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna* (*Bibliothèque du Muséon*, vol. 18), Tome I-II, Louvain 1944-49.

PRZYLUSKI, *Açoka* = J. PRZYLUSKI, *La légende de l'empereur Açoka dans les textes indiens et chinois* (*Annales du Musée Guimet*, Tome 31), Paris 1923.

PRZYLUSKI, *Concile* = J. PRZYLUSKI, *Le concile de Rājagṛha*, Paris 1926.

PRZYLUSKI, *Le Nord-Ouest de l'Inde* = J. PRZYLUSKI, *Le Nord-Ouest de l'Inde dans le Vinaya des Mūla-Sarvāstivādin et les textes apparentés*, in *JAs*, 1914, II, pp. 493-568.

PRZYLUSKI, *Le Parinirvāṇa* = J. PRZYLUSKI, *Le Parinirvāṇa et les funérailles du Buddha* (Extrait du *Journal Asiatique*, 1918-1920).

E. FRAUWALLNER

THE EARLIEST VINAYA AND THE BEGINNINGS OF BUDDHIST LITERATURE

I. – The schools of Buddhism and the missions of Aśoka.

The Vinaya is of the highest importance for the study of the earliest Buddhist literature and its development. While the Sūtrapiṭaka, with the exception of some fragments, has come down to us in the tradition of only one school (and that a scarcely important one for the general development), we possess the Vinayas of no less than six schools. We have here, therefore, our only chance of getting more precise information on the origin and development of the earliest Buddhist literature. I shall thus place at the basis of the following discussion the Vinaya according to the tradition of the various schools, and we shall be concerned above all with that part of it which is known by the name *Skandhaka* (*P. Khandhaka*).

The Vinayas of the following schools are preserved: Sarvāstivādin, Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka, the Pāli school [1],

[1] With this name I indicate the school by which Buddhism was introduced into Ceylon, as well as the schools of Ceylon as far as they directly reproduce the tradition of the home country. For a later period, when in Ceylon a development of its own was started which gradually wielded influence on the home country too, the name Tāmraparṇīya for the Singhalese schools seems to be preferable.

Mūlasarvāstivādin and Mahāsāṃghika [1]. Of these, the Vinayas of the Sarvāstivādin, Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka and Mahāsāṃghika exist in Chinese translations, the Vinaya of the Pāli school in the original Pāli language, the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin in Chinese and Tibetan translations, to which lately considerable sections of the Sanskrit original have been added [2].

It has been known for a long time that a close relationship exists between all these works, both in the general outline and in the particulars. They are all of them divided in two parts: the *Vibhaṅga*, i.e. the commentary on the ancient confession rules of the Prātimokṣa, and the *Skandhaka*, i.e. the exposition of the Buddhist monastic rules, to which several appendices are usually added [3].

Taking the *Skandhaka* first, we can see at once that the agreement of the texts reaches deep into the particulars. It is strikingly close with four schools above all: Sarvāstivādin, Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka and the Pāli school. Of course we have to disregard the formal subdivisions appearing in the extant texts. These subdivisions are in contradiction with the inner structure and are palpably late, as is the case e.g. with the *Mahāvagga* and *Cullavagga* of the Pāli school and the *Saptadharmaka* and *Aṣṭadharmaka* of the Sarvāstivādin. Nor must we allow

1) The following abbreviations will be employed for these schools: Sarvāstivādin = S, Dharmaguptaka = Dh, Mahīśāsaka = M, Pāli school = P, Mūlasarvāstivādin = Ms, Mahāsāṃghika = Mhs.

2) Published in *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. III, Srinagar 1942. I quote the Pāli Vinaya in the edition of H. Oldenberg, London 1879-1883; the first two volumes have appeared also in the series of the Pali Texts Society. The Chinese texts are quoted according to the Taishō edition of the Tripiṭaka by J. Takakusu and K. Watanabe, Tokyo 1924-1929. The Tibetan bKa'-'gyur was not accessible to me.

3) On the details of the structure of these texts see the Appendix.

ourselves to be led astray by the fact that the sequence of the several sections is partly uncertain, that some sections appear under different titles in the various schools and that occasionally in this or that school several sections are joined into one. If we consider the contents only, disregarding all these external features, the result is a complete agreement. This is clearly shown by the following table, in which the titles of the sections are given in Sanskrit according to the tradition of the Mūlasarvāstivādin, but are listed in the order which appears to me to have most chances of being the original one; numbers refer to the corresponding sections in the texts of the several schools, according to the numeration in the Appendix.

	S	Dh	M	P
1. Pravrajyāvastu	1	1	1	1
2. Poṣadhavastu	2	2	2	2
3. Varṣāvastu	4	3	3	3
4. Pravāraṇāvastu	3	4	4	4
5. Carmavastu	5	5	6	5
6. Bhaiṣajyavastu	6	7	7 + 8	6
7. Cīvaravastu	7	6	5	8
8. Kaṭhinavastu	8	8	9	7
9. Kośāmbakavastu	9	9	11 *b*	10
10. Karmavastu	10	10	11 *c*	9
11. Pāṇḍulohitakavastu	11	11	11 *d*	11
12. Pudgalavastu	12 *a*	12	11 *a*	13
13. Pārivāsikavastu	12 *b*	13	17	12
14. Poṣadhasthāpanavastu	13	14	16	19
15. Śamathavastu	15	16	10	14
16. Saṃghabhedavastu	16	15	12	17
17. Śayanāsanavastu	14	19	13	16
18. *Ācāravastu	17 *c*	18	15	18
19. Kṣudrakavastu	17 *a*	20	14	15
20. Bhikṣuṇīvastu	17 *b*	17	19	20

The *Skandhaka* consist therefore of twenty sections, all of which occur with the four schools mentioned above. This agreement extends also to the contents of the sections. Many differences are indeed apparent in the arrangement and elaboration of the materials. But if we disregard all those differences which can be explained through corruption of the tradition or through re-elaboration in accordance with the bias of the several schools, no others are left but such as are characteristic of the free oral tradition of earlier times [1]. The materials are the same, the inserted legends are the same, discrepancies are merely such as are bound to occur when several narrators tell the same story freely from memory [2].

Such a deep-going agreement leads us to the necessary conclusion that all these texts go back to the same origin. We must therefore accept a common basic work, from which the Vinaya texts of the above mentioned schools are derived. This conclusion in its turn gives rise to some important questions. How did it happen that these schools accepted the same Vinaya? Is it possible in this connection to ascertain the origin and date of this basic text?

The most obvious way would be to connect the reception of the Vinaya with the rise of the above mentioned schools, and thus to look for information to those works which contain accounts of the rise of the Buddhist schools.

[1] On this see the Appendix.

[2] For the benefit of readers who have no access to the original texts, may I point out as an example the researches of S. Lévi, in which he gives us the translation of some texts according to their different recensions. Such are e.g. *Sur la récitation primitive des textes bouddhiques* (J.As., 1915. I, pp. 401-447; legend of Koṭikarṇa); *Les Seize Arhats Protecteurs de la Loi* (J.As., 1916, II, pp. 5-50 and 189-305; legend of Piṇḍola Bhāradvāja).

But although this procedure might seem sound enough at first sight, it can be used only with prudence and moderation, as it is exposed to serious objections. In the first place these accounts are late, uncertain and contradictory, and cannot be relied upon blindly. But above all we must take into account the following considerations. The rise of the schools, as reflected in those accounts, is due to differences of opinion on points of dogma. Discussions on the Vinaya are seldom heard of, play a role of some import only in the so-called second council of Vaiśālī; and there they do not lead to a split into different schools. But in the case of school formations on dogmatic grounds it remains to be seen how far the Vinaya was influenced thereby. We know that the bearers of the dogmatic tradition were as a rule different from the bearers of the Vinaya tradition. And we know that, for example, at the time of the rise of Mahāyāna the followers of the new current for a long time had to adhere, from the point of view of the Vinaya, to one of the older Hīnayāna schools [1]. Thus the Vinaya remained at first untouched by this totally new and revolutionary development. In our quest for the origin and development of the Vinaya texts we shall have, therefore, to utilize the account of the rise of the Buddhist schools only with due caution and criticism.

Generally speaking, however, we may take the following principles as granted. The spread and development of the Vinaya went on in closest connection with the spread

[1] Cf. L. DE LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Opinions sur les relations des deux Véhicules au point de vue du Vinaya* (Académie Royale de Belgique, *Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres et des Sciences morales et politiques*, 5me série, T. XVI, 1930, Nos 1-2, pp. 20-39.

of Buddhism itself. Indeed, every foundation of a new community reposed upon the transmission and application of the monastic rules. On the other side, it is not to be taken for granted that a highly developped dogmatic or philosophical teaching of a certain tendency was necessarily handed over at the same time. Further the Vinaya must have received a particular elaboration probably only in such cases when the community developped a strong particular life of its own. The necessary conditions for this were found above all in the religious centres which showed more lively activity, and also in faraway mission territories, which naturally had to rely upon a flourishing spiritual life in their own midst. On the contrary, the formation of dogmatic schools took place as a rule inside communities already existing; and it is much to be questioned whether their diffusion followed the same lines as formerly the foundation of the communities. Such school formations did not necessarily imply a modification of the Vinaya, although it is possible that strongly individualized schools tried to characterize themselves also by external peculiarities in the application of the Vinaya rules [1]. The diffusion and development of the Vinaya and the rise of the dogmatic schools rest thus upon completely different bases and proceed upon diverging lines. This we must never lose sight of in the course of our discussion.

We shall now try to answer the questions put above in the light of these postulates. If we consider the tradition about the Buddhist schools, we get about the follow-

1) Among those I should like to include the differences in clothing mentioned e.g. by I-ching; *Nan hai chi kuei nei fa chuan*, T 2125, ch. 2, p. 214 a 18 seqq. (= Takakusu, pp. 66 seqq.) etc.

ing picture [1]. In the first instance the Buddhist schools, according to the general opinion, are divided into two great groups, the Mahāsāṃghika and the Sthavira. These are the two divisions into which the earliest community was split after the council of Pāṭaliputra in the 2nd century after the Nirvāṇa [2]. In the second place two groups took shape within the Sthavira [3]. One of them is at first placed under the general name of the Vātsīputrīya and later under that of the Sāṃmatīya. The other has no general name, but in later times the expression Sarvāstivādin is often employed as such.

If we consider these groups in detail, we remark a peculiar fact. We are told that there were several schools of the Mahāsāṃghika, and their existence is confirmed by the *Kathāvatthu*, which goes deep into the technicalities of their scholastic discussions. Nonetheless, they do not appear to have been schools of lasting independent value. The extant tradition speaks as a rule only of the Mahāsāṃghika in general [4]. Hsüan-tsang too studied in India the Abhidharma "of the Mahāsāṃghika" [5]. The single schools are left completely in the background. It may be that the schools mentioned in the *Kathāvatthu* enjoyed only a short life and disappeared early; or perhaps this reti-

[1] I shall avoid here as much as possible to enter into particulars, since a detailed examination of the problem of Buddhist schools by A. Bareau is to appear shortly, and I do not wish to anticipate him.

[2] See my paper *Die buddhistischen Konzile*, in *ZDMG*, 102, 1952, pp. 243 seqq.

[3] After the 7th century A. D. the Singhalese schools too appear as a particular group; but this is a later development and does not concern us here.

[4] See, e.g., the manner in which the *Mahāvibhāṣāśāstra* and the *Abhidharmakośa* cite the Mahāsāṃghika.

[5] *Chuan*, T 2053, ch. 4, p. 241 *b* 29.

cence is but the reflection of an one-sided historical outlook of the Northern tradition. In any case the Mahāsāṃghika in the main lines appear to us as a unity and may be treated as such.

The case of the Vātsīputrīya is similar. Originally they were divided into four schools, of which one, the Sāṃmatīya, gradually gained the upper hand and displaced the others. Later the Sāṃmatīya in their turn split into several schools, none of which however obtained any importance; they can be safely disregarded. The older schools are, almost all of them, mentioned in inscriptions [1]. Nevertheless they seem to have enjoyed only a local importance and never to have played independent roles. Whenever the theories of different schools are discussed, we find the Vātsīputrīya-Sāṃmatīya practically alone mentioned [2]. And we are told that all the schools possessed the same Abhidharma, which they merely interpreted in different ways [3]. Thus this group too is practically to be considered as a unity.

Quite different is the case of the next group, which includes the schools of the Sarvāstivādin, Kāśyapīya, Dharmaguptaka and Mahīśāsaka. These are absolutely distinct schools with doctrines and texts of their own. This is shown even outwardly by the fact that they are always quoted under their own names. I shall give only the following example. In the Life of Hsüan-tsang (T 2053, ch. 6, p. 252 c 5 seqq.) and at the end of the *Hsi yü chi*

1) The Sāṃmatīya at Sārnāth, the Dharmottarīya at Kārlā and Junnar, the Bhadrayāṇīya at Kaṇhēri and Nāsik.

2) The *Kathāvatthu* mentions once the Bhadrayāṇiya.

3) Cf. P. DEMIÉVILLE, *L'origine des sectes bouddhiques d'après Paramārtha*, p. 58 seq., in *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques*, I, 1931-32, pp. 15-64.

(T 2087, ch. 12, p. 946 c 15 seqq.) there are lists of the texts brought home by Hsüan-tsang from India. They include 15 works of the Mahāsāṃghika, 15 of the Sāṃmatīya, 22 of the Mahīśāsaka, 17 of the Kāśyapīya, 42 of the Dharmaguptaka and 67 of the Sarvāstivādin. In the case of the Mahāsāṃghika and Sāṃmatīya the groups alone are mentioned, while in the third group the several schools are listed.

Now a mere glance shows that the last group coincides with those schools, the Vinaya of which we have begun to discuss. There we had to do with the Sarvāstivādin, Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka and the Pāli school. Here we find mentioned the Sarvāstivādin, Kāśyapīya, Dharmaguptaka and Mahīśāsaka. The reason why in the first case we left out of account the Kāśyapīya, is that their Vinaya has not come down to us and therefore could not be utilized. On the other hand, the silence under which the accounts of the rise of the Buddhist schools pass the Pāli school, is to be explained by the fact that this school lost very early its importance in the home country, while the derived schools in Ceylon came to the fore only in a later period (after the beginning of our era) and then were treated by the tradition of the home country as a particular group. Neither of these facts, therefore, jeopardizes the agreement. We may also remark here that another school is to be added to this group, and therefore is to be considered in the following discussion: the Haimavata school. The reasons for its not being mentioned in the tradition along with the others are the following. The Haimavata went their own ways in the dogmatic field, and are said to have accepted, alone among the Sthavira, the five theses which caused the split of the

Mahāsāṃghika from the Sthavira [1]. Moreover they became extinct quite early [2]. But their Vinaya points clearly to a close relationship with the other schools of this group [3].

We infer from what we said above that the schools, with whose Vinaya we are concerned, occupy a special position among the Buddhist schools. While the other sects, may they belong to the Mahāsāṃghika group or to the Vātsīputrīya–Sāṃmatīya group, recede into the background in comparison with the groups, so that practically we are confronted with the groups alone, on the contrary the above mentioned schools, notwithstanding their mutual relationship, stand before us as well-individualized independent schools, and are cited and treated as such.

We get the same picture if we utilize the information about the Vinaya of the various schools. Once more in the case of the Mahāsāṃghika the tradition knows of no separate Vinayas of the single schools, but only of one "Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika", a work which, as mentioned above, is preserved in Chinese translation [4]. In the same way in the case of the Vātsīputrīya–Sāṃmatīya we hear only of a "Vinaya of the Vātsīputrīya", which is supposed to have been a modified version of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya [5]. On the other side, to the schools of the third group one Vinaya each is attributed. All these

1) See VASUMITRA, *Samayabhedoparacanacakra*, T 2031, p. 16 c 12 seq. Cf. also P. DEMIÉVILLE, loc. cit., p. 40, A b.

2) See Tāranātha, ed. A. Schiefner, St. Petersburg 1868, p. 134 (Ue. p. 175).

3) Cf. J. PRZYLUSKI, *Concile*, pp. 169 and 316; M. HOFINGER, *Étude sur le concile de Vaiśālī* (Bibliothèque du Muséon, vol. 20), Louvain 1946, p. 166.

4) *Mo-ho-sêng-ch'i lü*, T 1425 (Nj. 1119); cf. supra, p. 1.

5) Cf. the material assembled by LIN LI-KOUANG, *L'aide-mémoire de la vraie loi*, Paris 1949, pp. 296 seqq.

works, with the exception of the Vinaya of the Kāśyapīya, are preserved in Chinese translations [1] and a perusal of them supports the evidence of the tradition. In opposition to the quite different Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika they appear closely related, and yet stand forth as separate schools.

The same result can be gathered from a piece of evidence, which considers the Buddhist schools from the point of view of the Vinaya tradition. An ancient much quoted tradition enumerates five Vinaya schools: Mahāsāṃghika, Sarvāstivādin, Kāśyapīya, Dharmaguptaka and Mahīśāsaka [2]. These are the Mahāsāṃghika and the schools of the third group. Here too the Mahāsāṃghika are mentioned only as a group, while the schools of the third group are listed individually. The absence of the Vātsīputrīya group can be easily explained, if their Vinaya was really only a modified Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika, as maintained by the tradition.

Summing up the foregoing discussion, we can state our case thus. The schools, with whose Vinaya we are concerned, form a group of their own among the Buddhist schools. In fact, while the other schools fade in the background behind the groups to which they belong, these seem to have enjoyed a well-defined separate life. Moreover, the Vinaya plays with them an outstanding role, and

[1] *Shih sung lü*, T 1435, Nj. 1115, 1144 (= Sarvāstivādin); *Ssŭ fên lü*, T 1428, Nj. 1117 (= *Dharmaguptaka*); *Wu fên lü*, T 1421, Nj. 1122 (= *Mahīśāsaka*).

[2] HSÜAN-TSANG, *Hsi yü chi*, T 2087, ch. 3, p. 882 *b* 18 seqq. Cf. also the material assembled by LIN LI-KOUANG, loc. cit., pp. 188 seqq. Lin Li-kouang, however, tried to connect this subdivision, which concerns exclusively the Vinaya, with the other information about the Buddhist schools, and was led thereby to quite impossible theories.

this goes so far that they are expressly mentioned as Vinaya schools. Lastly, the Vinaya of all these schools, although they are works handed down quite independently from each other, are closely related. And thus we are faced with the question: how is all this to be explained?

In my view everything becomes quite clear once we admit that all these schools were originally communities which owed their foundation to missions in distant countries and only later developped (in greater or lesser measure) into schools in the dogmatic sense of the word. This justifies the outstanding importance of the Vinaya in these schools, since the Vinaya naturally played the role of a starting point and of a basis when missionary communities were founded. It explains also their well-defined individualities, as circumstances favourable to a separate development prevailed above all in missionary communities which were at a long distance from the centre. Lastly, the close agreement of their Vinaya text can be easily explained once we admit that all these missions started from the same centre, and therefore brought with them the same Vinaya. This single Vinaya was later so far modified in the tradition of the various communities, that the result was the rise of several different works, whose uniformity of contents still points to the same origin.

But this raises at once another question: which were the missions that established these communities? The reply is obvious. Buddhist tradition knows in the early period only one great missionary enterprise, which was directed toward widely separated countries, viz. the missions of the period of the great emperor Aśoka. It is, therefore, but natural to carry the origin of the communities,

with which we are concerned, back to these very missions [1]. But before we undertake to investigate how far such a connection is justified, it is advisable to piece together all that we know of Aśoka's missions and to recall the picture we gain of them from the tradition.

The Buddhist missions of the time of Aśoka are attested by the Singhalese chronicles; disregarding the secondary sources, we find accounts of them in the *Dīpaṃvasa* (ch. VIII), in the *Mahāvaṃsa* (ch. XII) and in the historical introduction to the *Samantapāsādikā* (pp. 63, 19–69, 15). According to them Tissa Moggaliputta, after the council which is said to have been held under his chairmanship in Pāṭaliputra 236 years after the Nirvāṇa, and which the Pāli school counts as the third council, caused missionaries to be sent to the following countries:

1. Majjhantika to Gandhāra (and Kaśmīra),
2. Mahādeva to the Mahisa country,
3. Rakkhita to Vanavāsa,
4. Yonakadhammarakkhita to Aparantaka,
5. Mahādhammarakkhita to Mahāraṭṭha,
6. Mahārakkhita to the Yonaka country,
7. Kassapagotta, Majjhima, Durabhisara (Dundubhissara), Sahadeva and Mūlakadeva (Alakadeva) to the Himavanta,
8. Soṇa (Soṇaka) and Uttara to Suvaṇṇabhūmi,

[1] In relation with the following discussion, I should like to point out that the very nature of the tradition has repeatedly led scholars to place some of the above mentioned schools in relation with the missions of the time of Aśoka. I refer above all to J. PRZYLUSKI, *Concile*, p. 313 seqq. But this idea, as far as I can see, was never followed up earnestly and consequently. And above all, the distinction between rise of schools and rise of communities has never been properly drawn, although it helps us to understand and explain several peculiarities of the tradition.

9. Mahinda, Iṭṭhiya (Iddhiya), Uttiya, Bhaddasāla and Sambala to Laṅkā (Tambapaṇṇi).

Much has been written on the credibility of this account, both for and against it. Now it is possible to show that all these tales in their core go back to a church history of the home country, which arrived in Ceylon at the beginning of the 1st century B. C. at the latest [1]. Their evidence gains therefrom a large additional weight, since the distance of time from the events narrated is considerably narrowed down, to 150 years at the utmost. Generally speaking it is clear that historical information in India may be eventually distorted and covered up with legends during such a period, but even then the basic facts may be accorded a great degree of probability. In our case, therefore, the very existence of the above mentioned accounts makes it likely that the missions to which they refer did really occur.

Besides, a confirmation of their validity has often been sought in the inscriptions of the relic caskets discovered in the stūpas in the neighbourhood of Bhīlsā, the ancient Vidiśā [2]. Relics of the Hemavata Dudubhisara, of Majhima and of Kāssapagota, the teacher of all the Hemavatas, have been found in stupa No. 2 at Sōnāri and in stupa No. 2 at Sāñci [3]. These are three of the missionaries of the Himālaya country (supra No. 7). The historicity of this mission is thus confirmed by epigraphic evidence of an early date.

[1] This will be shown in detail later on.

[2] Cf. e.g. W. GEIGER, *The Mahāvaṃsa translated into English*, London 1912 (1950), pp. XIX seq.; J. PRZYLUSKI, *Concile*, p. 317 seq.; L. DE LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *L'Inde aux temps des Mauryas et des Barbares, Grecs, Scythes Parthes et Yue-tchi (Histoire du Monde*, Tome VI), Paris 1930, p. 136.

[3] H. LÜDERS, *A List of Brahmi Inscriptions*, Appendix to *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. X, No. 156, 157, 158, 655 and 656.

At the same time this throws a favourable light on the data of the other missions.

Lastly, we must take into account the evidence of Aśoka's inscriptions. In his XIII Rock Edict the emperor mentions the peoples to whom he has sent his messengers [1] and upon whom he has obtained the "Victory of the Teaching" (*dhammavijaya*). Outside his empire, these are the Greek kingdoms of the Diadochs in the West and the Coḍa and Paṇḍiya in the South as far as Taṃbapaṃni. Within his empire are the Yona-Kaṃboja, the Nābhaka-Nābhapaṃti (Nabhiti), the Bhoja-Pitinikya (Pitinika) and the Adha (Andhra)-Pālada (Pārinda). Many of these names are of rare occurrence or completely unknown. The localization of the peoples concerned is therefore uncertain. Nevertheless in the general outlines a fairly clear picture can be obtained. The Yona and Kamboja occupied the Iranian border territories to the North-West of the Maurya empire [2]. The Nābhaka and Nābhapaṃti in all likelihood are to be sought for in the Himālaya [3]. The Bhoja and Pitinika may be located in Western Deccan [4]. And the name of the Aṃdhra, who are coupled with the Pālada, points toward the Telugu country. They are mostly the same peoples, who represented the field of activity of the Dhammamahāmattā, mentioned by Aśoka in his V Rock Edict [5]. He speaks there of the Yona-

[1] This may be inferred from the following words: "even where messengers do not go" (*yatta pi dutā devānampiyassā no yamti*).

[2] Cf. J. Bloch, *Les inscriptions d'Aśoka*, Paris 1950, p. 103, footnote.

[3] Cf. E. Hultzsch, *Inscriptions of Aśoka* (*Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, vol. I), Oxford 1925, p. xxxix, n. 12.

[4] Cf. J. Bloch, op. cit., p. 103, and E. Hultzsch, op. cit., p. xxxix.

[5] The Rock Edicts of Aśoka too, with the exception of the Kaliṅga edicts, are found almost exclusively in these territories.

country; Rakkhita (No. 3) in Vanavāsa, i.e. Northern Kamboja–Gamdhāra, of the Raṭṭhika (Riṣṭika)–Pitinika (Peteṇika) and "other Western peoples" (*aṃne āpalaṃtā*). Of these, the country of the Gamdhāra includes chiefly the territory from Takṣaśilā to the lower Kabul valley. The Raṭṭhika are usually connected with the countries of Surāṣṭra and Mahārāṣṭra [1]. The missions of Aśoka extended thus to the frontier provinces to the North, West and South of the Maurya empire, to the Greek kingdoms in the West and to the Dravidian states in the South as far as Ceylon. It is noteworthy that the Eastern neighbours of the Maurya empire are completely missing. Even the newly-conquered Kaliṅga country is not mentioned, al though opportunities for missionary work were surely not wanting there.

If we compare with these data the account of the missions in the Singhalese chronicles, we must at once state that the two sources look at the same things from different points of view. Aśoka speaks of peoples, the missionary account speaks of countries. Nevertheless a far-reaching agreement is not to be denied [2]. If we list the missions mentioned in the accounts according to the countries to which they were sent [3], the mission of Kassapagotta (No. 7) included the Himālaya country, the mission of Majjhantika (No. 1) Gandhāra and Kaśmīr, the mission of Mahārakkhita (No. 6) the Yonaka country, i.e. the Iranian frontier. Yonakadhammarakkhita (No. 4) worked in Aparantaka, i.e. Gujarāt and Kāṭhiāvāṛ; Mahādhammarakkhita (No. 5) in Mahāraṭṭha, the Marāṭha

1) Cf. J. Bloch, op. cit., p. 103, No. 9.

2) Cf. J. Bloch, op. cit., p. 103, No. 9.

3) On the position of these countries see above all W. Geiger, *The Mahāvaṃsa translated into English*, London 1912 (1950), pp. 82 seqq.

Kānara. It is uncertain where to look for Mahisa, Mahādeva's (No. 2) mission country, but it may be localized somewhere in the Northern Deccan. To these we can add the mission territories of Mahinda (No 9) and Soṇa (No. 8), which are Ceylon and Farther India. The countries mentioned by the accounts of the missions cover therefore the same area as that gleaned from Aśoka's inscriptions. Here too we are confronted with the frontier territories to the North, West and South of the Maurya empire; and here too the East is characteristically missing [1]. This is certainly no freak of chance. And we feel therefore justified in seeking in the data of the inscriptions of Aśoka a confirmation of the missions' account of the Singhalese chronicles.

In this connection I wish to discuss also the question: who was responsible for the missionaries being sent out and which was their starting place? From the text of the inscriptions one gathers the impression that Aśoka himself sent out the missionaries. On the other side the account of the missions mentions Tissa Moggaliputta as their organizator [2]. But we must remember that the data of the Singhalese chronicles are uncertain on this point. The account of the missions going back to the church history of the mother community gives the merit of the conversion of Ceylon to Tissa Moggaliputta, but the native tradition attributes it to the initiative of Aśoka [3]. The second

[1] Ceylon and Further India too are connected with the Western countries, since the then available communications went by way of the sea ports of the Western coast, above all Bharukaccha.

[2] *Dipavaṃsa*, VIII, v. 1 seqq.; *Samantapāsādikā*, p. 63, 20-25; *Mahāvaṃsa*, XII, v. 1 seqq.

[3] *Dipavaṃsa*, XI, v. 14 seqq.; *Samantapāsādikā*, p. 74, 7 seqq.; *Mahāvaṃsa*, XI, v. 7 seqq.

alternative must be accepted as the correct one, on the basis of the epigraphic evidence. The mother community tried apparently to enhance the glory of its patriarch by putting on his merit the sending out of the missions.

The starting place of the missions stands fairly certain in the case of the Ceylon mission: it was Vidiśā. Ceylon was colonized from Bharukaccha [1]. Communications were quite frequent also in the following centuries [2]. We know that the canon of the Holy Scriptures brought by the missionaries to Ceylon came from Mālava. Lastly, there is the tradition that Mahinda, the apostle of Ceylon, hailed on his mother's side from Vidiśā [3] and started thence on his journey to Ceylon [4]. We can therefore assert with a fair amount of certainty that the Singhalese mission came from Vidiśā on the sea route through Bharukaccha. But then it is obvious to look to Vidiśā also for the starting point of the other missions. The geographical position is in favour of this, and the archaeological remains, going as far back as the times of Aśoka, show that Vidiśā in the last centuries B. C. enjoyed a quite extraordinary importance as religious centre. There is also further evidence. As already told, relics of the

[1] *Dīpavaṃsa*, IX, vv. 26-28.

[2] Cf. S. Lévi, *Ptolémée, le Niddesa et la Bṛhatkathā*, in *Études Asiatiques*, II, Paris 1925, pp. 1-55. It is noteworthy that according to the oldest tradition, *Dīpavaṃsa*, XVI, v. 2 (cf. also XV, v. 87) the branch of the Bodhi tree was brought to Ceylon through the Vindhya mountains, i.e. through the Western ports. Only the later developments of the legend, as preserved in the *Samantapāsādikā*, p. 96-97, and hence in *Mahāvaṃsa*, XIX, v. 1-6, have brought in, in accordance with later conditions, the name of Tāmalitti.

[3] *Dīpavaṃsa*, XII, v. 15; *Samantapāsādikā*, p. 70, 4-9; *Mahāvaṃsa*, XIII, v. 6-11.

[4] *Dīpavaṃsa*, XII, v. 35 seq.; *Samantapāsādikā*, p. 71, 13-17; *Mahāvaṃsa*, XIII, v. 18-20.

apostles of the Himalayan region, Dundubhisara, Majjhima and Kāsapagota, were found in the stūpas near Vidiśā. But these men were certainly not such famous saints that faraway countries should exert themselves to get their relics. They must therefore stand in some particular relation to Vidiśā [1]. And such a relation is easily found in the fact that the mission they led started from Vidiśā. In such case it was their home city, to which their relics were brought and where they were buried. Thus this discovery of relics stands justified and at the same time we get an additional proof that Vidiśā was the starting point of the missions.

Now we can turn to the question, in which relation the above mentioned schools stand to the missions of Aśoka. Firstly, we notice a far-going agreement of the homes of these schools with the territories in which the missions were active. If, in fact, we try to ascertain more exactly the home of these schools [2], no doubt is possible concerning the Haimavata. We know both from tradition [3] and from the general consensus that they had their seats in the Himālaya. The Kāśyapīya were met by Hsüan-tsang [4] and I-ching [5] only in Uḍḍiyāna and Eastern

[1] Of course it is not admissible to point to Christian parallels, because saints' relics did not play the same role in Buddhism as in Christianism.

[2] Of course we mean their original home. Many schools have gradually spread much farther than the region of their origin, and isolated offshoots in other places are of common occurrence with nearly all of them.

[3] Cf. the evidence of Paramārtha in P. Demiéville, *L'origine des sectes bouddhiques*, in *Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques*, I, 1931-32, pp. 54 and 56.

[4] *Hsi yü chi*, T 2087, ch. 3, p. 882 *b* 19; when he lost a part of his books at the crossing of the Indus, the king of Kaśmīr caused the Tripiṭaka of the Kāśyapīya to be copied for him in Uḍḍiyāna, *Chuan*, T 2053, ch. 5, p. 249 c 5-7.

[5] *Nan hai chi kuei nei fa chuan*, T 2125, ch. I, p. 206 c 2.

Turkestan. Epigraphically they are also attested in Gandhāra [1]. The principal seat of the Sarvāstivādin is generally accepted to have been located in Gandhāra and Kaśmīr [2]. The home of the Dharmaguptaka is to be sought for in the West, and above all in the North-West. Hsüan-tsang [3] and I-ching [4] know indeed of followers of this school only in Uḍḍiyāna and Eastern Turkestan. But it is certain that in earlier times they were far more widespread. The prophecy of Nandimitra (T 2030), probably issued from Dharmaguptaka circles, shifts the events to Surāṣṭra [5]. Buddhayaśas, the translator of the *Dīrghāgama* (T 1) and of the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka (T 1428) into Chinese, was at home in Kaśmīr. But at an earlier date the school seems to have been diffused above all in the Iranian frontier country. The earliest translators of Vinaya texts of the Dharmaguptaka (T 1432 and 1433) into Chinese were the Sogdian K'ang Sêng-k'ai and the Parthian T'an-ti [6]. And from the Iranian border the school may have spread even to China. The home of the Mahīśāsaka remains uncertain. We find them in the north as well as in the south. Hsüan-tsang [7] and I-ching [8] met them in Uḍḍiyāna and Eastern Turkestan. According

[1] *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, II, No. 33, p. 88; No. 34, p. 89; No. 55, p. 122; the connection of the Pabhosā inscription (*Epigraphia Indica*, II. 1894, No. 19, p. 242) with the Buddhist school is doubtful.

[2] On the Sarvāstivādin of Mathurā see the following chapter.

[3] *Hsi yü chi*, T 2087, ch. 3, p. 882 *b* 18 seq.

[4] *Nan hai chi kuei nei fa chuan*, T 2125, ch. 1, p. 206 *c* 1.

[5] Cf. S. Lévi, *Les Seize Arhats protecteurs de la Loi*, in *J.As.*, 1916, II, pp. 5 seqq.; corrected by J. Przyluski, *Conciles*, pp. 328 seqq.

[6] Cf. S. Lévi, op. cit., p. 40 and J. Przyluski, op. cit., p. 326 and No 3.

[7] *Hsi yü chi*, T 2087, ch. 3, p. 882 *b* 18 seq.

[8] *Nan hai chi kuei nei fa chuan*, T 2125, ch. I, p. 206 *c* 1.

to the biography of the translator Buddhajīva, their Vinaya was commonly found in Kaśmīr[1]. The famous Yogācāra master Asaṅga from Puruṣapura was at first a Mahīśāsaka[2]. A Mahīśāsaka monastery south of Takṣaśilā is mentioned in inscriptions[3]. On the other side they are attested also in Ceylon[4]. They had a monastery at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa on the banks of the Kṛṣṇā[5]. But it still remains uncertain where their original home was. Lastly, there cannot be any doubt about the home of the still existing Ceylon school.

Leaving aside the Mahīśāsaka, whose original seats are unknown, the home of all these schools is to be found in the ancient missions territory. Besides, there are other hints and even partly direct evidence. That Ceylon was converted by Mahinda under Aśoka, is a constant tradition. But also for the Sarvāstivādin school direct evidence is extant. The school itself mentions as its patriarch Madhyāntika, the Majjhantika of the Singhalese chronicles (No. 1), and narrates the legend of the conversion of Kaśmīr in quite the same way as they do[6]. In the case of the Kāśyapīya, it seems obvious to identify their founder, after whom they are named, with the Kāsapagota, whom the inscriptions of the relic caskets of Sāñci and Sōnāri

1) *Kao seng chuan*, T 2059, ch. 3, p. 339 *a* 3 seqq.; cf. P. Demiéville, *A propos du concile de Vaiśālī*, in *T'oung Pao*, XL, 1951, p. 293.

2) *Hsi yü chi*, T 2087, ch. 5, p. 896 *b* 28.

3) *Epigraphia Indica*, I, 1892, No. 29, pp. 238 seqq.

4) Fa-hsien acquired there a manuscript of their Vinaya (*Kao sêng Fa hsien chuan*, T 2085, p. 865 *c* 24) and the author of the *Jātakatthavaṇṇanā* wrote his work at the instance of a Mahiṃsāsaka monk (*The Jātaka*, ed. by Fausbøll, I, p. 1, v. 9).

5) *Epigraphia Indica*, XX, 1929-30, No. 1, H. p. 24.

6) Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin, *Kṣudrakavastu*, T 1451, ch. 40, p. 411 *a* 8-*b* 18; cf. also the following chapter.

mention as the master of all the Hemavatas [1]. There is nothing in the way of assuming that the mission under Kassapagotta, Majjhima, Dundubhisara etc. (No. 7), who went to the Himālaya, gave origin to two schools, the Haimavata and the Kāśyapīya, of whom one was expressly named after its founder. Even a connection of the name Dhammarakkhita, which occurs twice in the missions' account (No. 4 and 5), with the name of the Dharmaguptaka is not impossible, on account of the Indian delight in playfully exchanging synonymous words even in proper names [2]. Aparantaka, where Yonaka-Dhammarakkhita was sent (No. 5), would quite suit the Surāṣṭra of Nandimitra's prophecy. Lastly, it may seem not wholly unwarranted to connect the name of the Mahīśāsaka with the Mahisa country, to which Mahādeva went (No. 2) [3].

We may therefore assume with a fair measure of likelihood that the above mentioned schools go back to communities which owed their rise to the missions at the time of Aśoka. The mission of Kassapagotta, Majjhima and Dundubhiessara gave origin to the Haimavata and Kāśyapīya. The mission of Majjhantika led to the rise of the Sarvāstivādin. The Dharmaguptaka school is perhaps issued from the mission of Yonaka-Dhammarakkhita. There is, however, also the possibility that in this case several missionary communities may have merged together into one school (perhaps No. 4 and 6). The Mahīśāsaka school may perhaps be connected with the mission of Ma-

1) See supra, p. 10; cf. J. PRZYLUSKI, *Concile*, pp. 317 seqq. The "second Kāśyapa" (so called in contrast to Mahākāśyapa), known to Tāranātha in Gandhāra, seems to be the same person (ed. Schiefner, p. 40, 19 seq. = Ue, p. 50).

2) J. PRZYLUSKI, op. cit., p. 326 seq.

3) J. PRZYLUSKI, op. cit., p. 324 seq.

hādeva. And the community of Ceylon owes its origin to the mission of Mahinda. In this way, in accordance with the foregoing discussions, we have explained the special position of these schools among the rest; and we have given reasons for their well-defined individualities as well as for the great role which the Vinaya plays with them.

Now we can go back to the questions from which we have taken our start, i.e. how it is to be explained that all these schools have accepted the same Vinaya, and whether it is possible to say anything on the origin and date of the basic work. There is now no difficulty in answering these questions. The acceptance of the same Vinaya is the natural consequence of the origin of the schools from the same missionary enterprise. The missionaries who went out from the same centre brought of course with them one and the same Vinaya to the communities which they founded; and this was the Vinaya which was current at that time in their mother community.

We come therefore to the following conclusion. The Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin, Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka and of the Pāli school, or at least the *Skandhaka*, go back to the same basic text, viz. the Vinaya brought with them by the missionaries of Aśoka when they founded the oldest communities; and this was the Vinaya current about 250 B. C. in the region of Vidiśā.

2. – Sarvāstivādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin.

The identification of the basic text, from which the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin, Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka and of the Pāli school were derived, represents an important step toward our understanding of the development of the Vinaya; but only a step. The question of its first origin is not thereby solved. We have merely determined an early stage of development and a period *ante quem* for its rise. We feel therefore tempted to go beyond this. Such an attempt does not seem futile, as we have hitherto exploited only a part of the available material. We must not forget that, besides the works already cited, also the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin and of the Mahāsāṃghika have come down to us. It is thus but logical to try to get further results with their help. With this purpose in view we shall turn first to the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin.

As a matter of fact, a mere cursory perusal of this work leads us to expect further information. At first sight it seems very different from the works hitherto studied; but this is an illusion. This impression is caused by the fact that the legends inserted in the text are here much more elaborate, and that above all a great quantity of tales is added, which are introduced as events of former rebirths, as Jātaka. If, however, we disregard them and, without allowing ourselves to be influenced by them, consider the *Skandhaka* alone, we notice a far-going agreement. The same twenty sections as in the above discussed works occur here too, and their sequence

is the same as in the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin [1]. The legends found in those works have here their counterparts, albeit with many variants. Everything concerning the monastic rules is identical in the essentials. In spite of important differences, we notice such a far reaching agreement with the above mentioned works, that the surmise of a connection is unavoidable. We are thus faced with our next task, that of explaining this connection and of determining the relationship of this work to the above discussed Vinaya texts and to the basic work. But before we start upon this task, we must clear the field from a preliminary problem.

The Vinaya of which we are speaking is attributed by the tradition to the Mūlasarvāstivādin. What kind of school is this and in which relation does it stand with the Sarvāstivādin? That which the accounts of the Buddhist schools have to tell us is unsatisfactory. The name of the Mūlasarvāstivādin appears in them late, only from the 7th century onwards; and then either it serves (as with I-ching) for indicating the group including the Sarvāstivādin, Kāśyapīya, Dharmaguptaka and Mahīśāsaka [2], or else (as with Vinītadeva and in the *Varṣāgrapṛcchā*) Sarvāstivādin is employed as group-name and then Mūlasarvāstivādin is the name of one of the schools forming this group. In both cases it is a fanciful derivation from the name itself of the Mūlasarvāstivādin, which means "the original Sarvāstivadin". The idea is either that the name indicates the group as the original community from which the several schools are issued, or it is given

[1] Here too three sections are joined together into the *Kṣudrakavastu*.

[2] The relationship with the Sarvāstivādin is not clearly expressed in I-ching.

to the school which is credited with preserving the old pure teaching as against later derivations. But nothing is gained thereby. The fact that a school is believed to be the bearer of the genuine tradition and therefore gives expression to this credence in its very name, is so common and occurs so often without real justification, that no weight should be attached to it at all. In order to ascertain the position of the Mūlasarvāstivādin and their relationship with the Sarvāstivādin, we must therefore start from other premisses.

The following piece of evidence appears to be of outstanding importance in this connection [1]. At the end of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* [2], attributed to Nāgārjuna and translated into Chinese by Kumārajīva between 402 and 406 A. D., there is the question of the composition of the canon of the sacred scriptures; and this is what it has to say about the Vinaya (*Ta chih tu lun*, T 1509, ch. 100, p. 765 *c* 2-6):

"We call Vinaya the sins committed by the monks. The Buddha has given the precept: 'This should be done, this should not be done. Whoever does this and this, commits such and such a sin'. (The Vinaya) comprises, to say it briefly, eighty sections. Moreover, it consists of two parts. The first one, the Vinaya of Mathurā, includes also the Avadāna and Jātaka and comprises eighty sections. The second part, the Vinaya of Chi-pin (Kaśmīr), has rejected the Jātaka and Avadāna; it has accepted

1) The first to draw attention to it was Pelliot; it was utilized by J. PRZYLUSKI, *Açoka*, p. 214 seq.; Cf. also J. PRZYLUSKI, *Fables in the Vinaya Piṭaka of the Sarvāstivādin school*, in *IHQ*, V, 1929, pp. 1-5.

2) This is, as P. Demiéville has shown, the true old title of the work usually called *Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra* (see *J. As.*, 1950, p. 375, No. 1).

only the essentials and forms ten sections. There is, however, a Vibhāṣā in eighty sections, which explains it ".

It is well known that in the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* the Hīnayāna is represented by the Sarvāstivādin school; it seems therefore plausible to identify the two Vinayas there cited with the two works of this school that have come down to us, viz. the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin and of the Mūlasarvāstivādin [1]. And in fact the description given above would suit these two texts. The Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin differentiates itself, as we have seen, from the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin by an enormous quantity of fables, which are missing in the latter text. Thus the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin would be the Vinaya of Mathurā, and that of the Sarvāstivādin the Vinaya of Kaśmīr. Against such a simple solution, however, it may be urged that the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin shows evident connections with the North-West and chiefly with Kaśmīr, and on account of this scholars hitherto felt compelled to identify it with the Vinaya of Kaśmīr [2]. And for the sake of this identification the most artificial theories were propounded [3]. But we are going to show that the connections with Kaśmīr in the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin clearly represent later interpolations, while everything else points to Mathurā as the home of

[1] Both works are indeed thoroughly utilized in the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa*; cf. ÉT. LAMOTTE, *Traité*, II, p. XV seq.

[2] S. Lévi in J. PRZYLUSKI, *Le Nord-Ouest de l'Inde*, in *J.As.*, 1914, II, p. 494: « Il en ressort nettement, même sans l'aide d'une discussion, que l'école des Mūla-Sarvāstivādin avait ses attaches positives au Cachemire et dans les régions voisines ».

[3] Cf. J. PRZYLUSKI, *Açoka*, p. VIII seq.; and *Fables in the Vinaya-Piṭaka of the Sarvāstivādin school*, in *IHQ*, V, 1929, p. 4 seq.

the text. And thus we may see in this text the Vinaya of Mathurā.

There are chiefly two passages in the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin which bespeak a connection with Kaśmīr: the tale of the conversion of Kaśmīr by Madhyāntika and the account of the journey of the Buddha through North-Western India; and these two passages we must now examine in detail.

The tale of the conversion of Kaśmīr stands at the end of the *Kṣudrakavastu*. In fact, the last two sections of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin, the *Saṃghabhedavastu* (T 1450) and the *Kṣudrakavastu* (T 1451), contain a detailed biography of the Buddha, which ends with a *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (T 1451, p. 382 *b* 29-402 *c* 4). Then follow the council of Rājagṛha (— p. 408 *b* 25), the Nirvāṇa of Mahākāśyapa (— p. 409 *c* 8), the Nirvāṇa of Ānanda (— p. 411 *a* 5), the conversion of Kaśmīr by Madhyāntika (— p. 411 *b* 18) and a short enumeration of the following patriarchs (— p. 411 *c* 3). The council of Vaiśālī (— p. 414 *b* 11) forms the conclusion of the whole.

In the section with which we are chiefly concerned the account runs on the following lines [1]: After the council of Rājagṛha Mahākāśyapa considers his task as fulfilled and decides to enter Nirvāṇa. He hands over to Ānanda the custody of the Teaching and announces to him that Śaṇika (Śāṇavāsa) is going to be his successor. After having worshipped the relics of the Buddha, he goes to

1) For the greater part translated by J. Przyluski, *Le Nord-Ouest de l'Inde*, in *J.As.*, 1914, II, pp. 522-537. An exactly parallel text is presented by the Aśoka legend, *A-yü wang chuan*, T 2043, ch. 4, p. 114 *a* 26-116 *c* 18; *A-yü wang ching*, T 2043, ch. 7, p. 153 *a* 5-156 *b* 19; translated by J. Przyluski, *Açoka*, pp. 327-342.

king Ajātaśatru in order to inform him of his decision, but finds him asleep. Thereupon he betakes himself to the Kukkuṭapāda mountain and enters Nirvāṇa. Ajātaśatru and Ānanda show due honour to the corpse. In the meantime Śaṇika returns from a journey and, upon the invitation of Ānanda, becomes a monk. Ānanda, disappointed by the stubbornness of a monk who refuses to be corrected by him, decides to enter Nirvāṇa. He hands over to Śaṇika the custody of the Teaching and announces him that Upagupta will be his successor. King Ajātaśatru, whom he wants to inform of his decision, is asleep. As Ānanda wishes to offend neither Ajātaśatru nor the Licchavi of Vaiśālī, he proceeds to the middle of the Gaṅgā, in order to enter there Nirvāṇa and to divide his relics between Ajātaśatru and the Licchavi. At this moment the Ṛṣi Madhyandina (Madhyāntika) appears before him with 500 disciples, intending to enter the Order. Ānanda admits him, hands over to him the custody of the Teaching and charges him with the conversion of Kaśmīr; then he enters Nirvāṇa. After this the text narrates in a few words how Śaṇika transmitted the custody of the Teaching to Upagupta, who in his turn handed it over to Dhītika, who gave it to Kṛṣṇa, who gave it to Sudarśana. Then follows the account of the council of Vaiśālī.

While reading this account we notice at once how abruptly and clumsily the Madhyāntika episode interrupts the quiet flow of the narrative. Ānanda has regulated his succession and is on the point to enter Nirvāṇa, when Madhyāntika suddenly appears. He is introduced by very imposing miracles. He apprehends from an earthquake that Ānanda is on the point of entering Nirvāṇa, comes with his pupils flying through the air, and Ānanda through

his miraculous powers creates for them an island in the middle of the river, in order to carry out the monastic ordination. This stands in sharp contrast with the simple and natural course of the story of Śāṇavāsa. But there are also other serious objections. Ānanda has just finished handing over the custody of the Teaching to Śāṇavāsa, when Madhyāntika appears, and he entrusts him again with the custody of the Teaching. Thus there arises the contradiction that two patriarchs exist the one at the side of the other [1]. Accordingly, there were difficulties in the way of including both in the list of the patriarchs. And since Śāṇavāsa and Upagupta were indissolubly connected, it became necessary to make Madhyāntika the teacher of Śāṇavāsa [2]. Moreover, this juxtaposition of Śāṇavāsa and Madhyāntika cannot be old at all, because Śāṇavāsa, who belongs to the period of the second council, and Madhyāntika, who led one of the missions of Aśoka, were originally separated by a quite large interval of time. They have been, therefore, artificially coupled together only by the later tradition.

These difficulties vanish once we admit that the Madhyāntika episode is a late interpolation. And indeed an investigation of the structure of the narrative strongly supports such a supposition. Śāṇavāsa is carefully introduced in the narrative. Firstly the prophecy of Mahākāśyapa singles him out. Then we are told of his admission into the Order. And only then he is entrusted by Ānanda with the custody of the Teaching. In the same way the

1) There is no objection to this in the case of the division of a school. But this is not the case here. Madhyāntika stands alone beside the row of the other patriarchs. And the compilers of the list of the patriarchs looked at things in the same way.

2) Cf. PRZYLUSKI, *Açoka*, p. 47 seqq.

later appearance of Upagupta is prepared. Madhyāntika, on the contrary, appears quite suddenly and abruptly; and after he has fulfilled his task, he vanishes again, without us hearing anything further about him. The superficiality of the interpolation is quite evident. Moreover, the Madhyāntika episode could be safely expunged, without the context suffering in any way thereby: Ānanda has entrusted the Teaching to Śāṇavāsa, has prophesied Upagupta as his successor, betakes himself to the Gaṅgā and enters there Nirvāṇa. Then the tale goes on quite naturally to relate how Śāṇavāsa consecrates Upagupta as monk and hands over the teaching to him.

We come thus to the conclusion that the episode of Madhyāntika and of the conversion of Kaśmīr represents a late interpolation in the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin. The earlier tradition carried on the series of the patriarchs from Mahākāśyapa and Ānanda without interruption through Śāṇavāsa and Upagupta to Dhītika, Kṛṣṇa and Sudarśana[1]. Thus every trace of connection with Kaśmīr disappears. Śāṇavāsa and Upagupta are the local saints of Mathurā. And the series of patriarchs, which concludes the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin, is in its original form the patriarch series of Mathurā.

A close investigation of the account of the Buddha's journey through North-Western India leads to a similar result. The *Bhaiṣajyavastu* in the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin (T 1448; *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. III, Part I) describes a long journey of the Buddha and narrates the

[1] Perhaps a remnant of the old tradition is preserved in the lists of patriarchs which do not contain Madhyāntika (cf. PRZYLUSKI, *Açoka*, p. 48). We may note that also in the Vinaya account Śāṇavāsa does not mention Madhyāntika while handing the Teaching over to Upagupta.

events that happened in each place. This journey leads through Gandhāra as far as Uḍḍiyāna, and this for many scholars is another piece of evidence for the connection of this Vinaya with the North-West and with Kaśmīr [1]. But this evidence too lacks solidity, because it is easy to show that the part of the journey which concerns the North-West is a late interpolation. We are told that the Buddha accompanied by Ānanda travels from Hastinapura through Mahānagara, Śrughna, Brāhmaṇagrāma and Kālanagara to Rohitaka (T 1448, p. 37 *c* 6-39 *c* 21). There he summons the Yakṣa Vajrapāṇi and betakes himself in his company to the North-West (— p. 41 *c* 4; *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Part I, pp. 0-2). Then he returns to Rohitaka and resumes his journey along with Ānanda, who is highly surprised to hear that in the meantime the Buddha has already visited the North-West. The sudden interruption of the journey, the visit of the North-West by marvellous means in the company of a supernatural being, and then the continuation of the earlier journey, all this points, as clearly as it ever can be, to a later interpolation. But if we expunge that part of the journey which leads to the North-West in the company of Vajrapāṇi, then all the important places visited by the Buddha on his way lie on the upper course of the Gaṅgā and Yamunā, i.e. within the range of the community of Mathurā [2]. And thus it

1) T 1448, p. 37 *c* 6-42 *b* 27; *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. III, Part I, pp. 0-7, 13; translated by J. PRZYLUSKI, *Le Nord Ouest de l'Inde*, in *J.As.*, 1915, II, pp. 495-522. Further cf. ÉT. LAMOTTE, *Traité*, I, p. 548 seqq. and *Alexandre et le Bouddhisme*, 2. *Ādirājya et Bhadrāśva dans le Vinaya des Mūlasarvāstivādin*, in *BEFEO*, 44, 1947-50, pp. 152-158.

2) On the localisation of the several places see ÉT. LAMOTTE, op. cit. (*Ādirājya et Bhadrāśva*), p. 153 seq. Rohitaka meant originally Rohtak to the North-West of Delhi. It lies on the route from Śrughna through Brāh-

becomes clear that also in the case of the journey to North-Western India in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin the connection with the North-West belongs to a later interpolation, while the earlier portion of the account points to Mathurā.

A confirmation of this result is given by another text of the Mathurā school, the *Aśokarājasūtra*. As shown by the researches hitherto carried out on this work [1], all the versions preserved [2] go back to a basic text that was created between about 250 and 300 A. D. by the fusion of the old Aśoka legend with a church history. The church history, which of course derives from much earlier sources, began, as shown by the extant versions, with the last journey of the Buddha, told the tale of his Nirvāṇa, of the first council, of Mahākāśyapa's and Ānanda's Nirvāṇa, and after this it narrated the patriarchate of Śāṇavāsa and Upagupta. It was of course a church history of the community of Mathurā. This results from the fact that the legend of the local saints of Mathurā, Śāṇavāsa and Upagupta, occupies by far the greater space.

In this church history we find connections with Kaśmīr quite similar to those in the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāsti-

maṇagrāma to Mathurā, and its distance agrees approximately with the other stages of the journey. It was only upon the interpolation of the North-Western journey that it was equated with the town in the Indus region. The older portion of the journey was created at the time of the compilation of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin within the community of Mathurā, because the travel account in the corresponding section of the Vinaya of the other schools refers to the narrow Eastern territory, to which the range of view of the original community was limited.

1) J. Przyluski, *Açoka*; H. Lüders, *Bruchstücke der Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā des Kumāralāta*, Leipzig 1926, chiefly pp. 127 seqq.

2) *A-yü wang chuan*, T 2042; *A-yü wang ching*, T 2043; *Divyāvadāna*, XXVI-XXIX; *Tsa a-han ching*, T 99, ch. 23 and 25.

vādin. In the first place, after Ānanda's Nirvāṇa, it narrates the conversion of Kaśmīr by Madhyāntika. There is nothing to say about this, because both the tale and its insertion in the narrative completely agree with the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin. What we have said above, is valid here too. It is only to be noted that here a trace of the old tradition antecedent to the interpolation has been maintained [1]. As the conversion of Kaśmīr, so also the journey of the Buddha to the North-West finds a parallel in the church history. We are told [2], in fact, that on his last journey the Buddha on the way from Mathurā to Kuśinagarī suddenly tells Ānanda to catch his robe, flies with him to Chi-pin (Kaśmīr) and there prophesies the conversion of the country by Madhyāntika. Then both return and continue their journey to Kuśinagarī. In this account, exactly like in that of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, the travel is interrupted by a wondrous journey, after which there is a return to the point of departure and a continuation of the original journey in the usual manner. This is again the characteristic form which betrays a later interpolation, and we are justified in assuming one here. The consequence is that the church history is another work of the Mathurā school, which too shows a tendency to create connections with Kaśmīr through interpolations; and this supports the correctness of the same conclusion in the case of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin.

1) As shown by J. PRZYLUSKI, *Açoka*, p. 327, No. 1, the title of the 7th chapter of the *A-yü wang-ching* (T 2043, ch. 7, p. 152 *c* 11) mentions only 5 patriarchs. Madhyāntika is therefore not included.

2) *A-yü wang chuan*, T 2042, ch. 3, p. 112 *a* 7-12; *A-yü wang ching*, T 2043, ch. 6, p. 150 *a* 8-12; translated by PRZYLUSKI, *Le Nord-Ouest de l'Inde*, p. 340; *Açoka*, p. 311.

In the latter account there is a noteworthy peculiarity. It mentions a number of conversions effected by the Buddha before his arrival at Mathurā [1]. The same conversions are carried out in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* during his journey to the North-West. And it is peculiar that also in the church history, at least in one version, the *A-yü wang chuan*, they are expressly localized in the North-West. This is very strange. It would mean that the Buddha first visits the North-West in order to effect there the said conversions, then goes to Mathurā, whereupon he flies once more to Kaśmīr, in order to prophesy the conversion of this country. But this is completely absurd. The natural thing would be to attribute him this prophecy during the journey to the North-West, as it is done in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* [2]. The solution of this difficulty has been found by J. Przyluski, who showed that these conversions, and chiefly the conversion of the Nāga Apalāla, were originally localized in Magadha and were shifted only later to the North-West [3]. If, in fact, we admit that the church history originally placed these conversions in Magadha, everything becomes clear. Their account brought the Buddha's last journey from Magadha first to Mathurā, in order to find thus the occasion for placing in his mouth

1) *A-yü wang chuan*, T. 2042, ch. 1, p. 102 *b* 13-15; *A-yü wang ching*, T 2043, ch. 6, p. 149 *b* 22 seqq., cf. ch. 2, p. 135 *b* 14-16; *Divyāvadāna*, p. 348, 20-22, cf. 385, 3-5; *Tsa a-han ching*, T. 99, ch. 23, p. 165 *b* 21-23, in PRZYLUSKI, *Açoka*, pp. 245 and 308 No. 1.

2) T 1448, ch. 9, p. 40 *c* 16-22; in PRZYLUSKI, *Le Nord-Ouest de l'Inde*, p. 512 seqq.

3) J. PRZYLUSKI, *Açoka*, p. 6 seqq.; Przyluski merely did not draw the last consequences from his pertinent remarks. On the conversion of Apalāla see also ÉT. LAMOTTE, *Traité*, I, p. 188 No. 1. An account, which shifts the antecedents of Apalāla to Magadha, is found also in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, T. 1448, p. 16 *b* 1-17 *b* 20.

prophecies about Mathurā and its local saints; and thence to Kuśinagarī. When later it was desired to insert also a mention of Kaśmīr, the natural place for it was of course after the mention of Mathurā, since this is the western-most point reached on the journey. The author of the interpolation in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* apparently utilized the account of the church history for his description of the journey to the North-West, and has shifted the conversions contained therein to the North-West. When his account had met with universal acceptance, it happened that even in the church history, as it was the case in the *A-yü wang chuan*, it was presumed that these conversions happened in the North-West.

These facts in their turn throw new light on the account of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* and allow us to judge it with greater certainty. Since it was originated by the deformation of an account, which still maintained its original form in the church history, it is clearly late and cannot belong to the old core of the Vinaya. It is thus confirmed that we are confronted with a late interpolation. We can even determine with some approximation its date. On the one side it mentions the great Caitya of Kaniṣka in the neighbourhood of Peshāvar [1]; on the other side the above discussed modification of the tale of the conversions must have influenced already the *A-yü wang chuan*, which was translated into Chinese about 300 A. D., and moreover it was known also to the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* [2]. It must therefore belong to the period between 150 and 300 A. D.

1) T 1448, ch. 9, p. 41 *b* 25-*c* 1; in PRZYLUSKI, *Le Nord-Ouest de l'Inde*, p. 317.

2) T 1509, ch. 9, p. 126 *b* 27-*c* 5; ÉT. LAMOTTE, *Traité*, I, p. 546 seqq. and No. 3.

Summing up the results hitherto obtained, we can say that those passages of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin, which have led to its attribution to the Kaśmīr school, are late interpolations, and that the earlier portions of the work clearly point toward Mathurā. We are thus justified in considering it as the Vinaya of the Mathurā community. Another consequence is, that we have to look upon the Sarvāstivādin as the community of Kaśmīr and Gandhāra, upon the Mūlasarvāstivādin as the community of Mathurā [1].

But how shall we imagine the relationship of these two communities? J. Przyluski once supposed that the Buddhist communities in Kaśmīr and the neighbouring countries were founded from Mathurā [2]. He was led to it by his general conception of the diffusion of Buddhism. Besides, he was influenced by the idea that these communities belong to the same philosophical-dogmatic school. But according to our findings, this cannot be correct, because, as we have seen, the community of Kaśmīr owes its origin to the missions of Aśoka and was founded from Vidiśā. On the other side, the Mathurā community had nothing to do with these missions. It is an old community, much earlier than Aśoka, and plays an important role already at the time of the council of Vaiśālī. We are thus compelled to conclude that the communities of Kaśmīr and Mathurā are utterly independent from each other as to their origin.

[1] This is of course the original position. How the relations between the two schools developped in the course of the centuries, and how it happened that the mentions of Kaśmīr were introduced into the texts of the Mathurā school, is an interesting and important question. But its discussion would carry us far beyond the limits of the present investigation.

[2] J. Przyluski, *Açoka*, p. 14 seqq.

With this result agrees also what can be gleaned from the Vinaya of the two communities. All the comparisons of parallel sections have hitherto shown [1] that the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin largely agrees with the Vinaya of the other missionary schools and forms with them a close group, while the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin shows considerable differences. Both facts are explained if the Sarvāstivādin, as we believe, had the same origin as the other missionary schools, while the Mūlasarvāstivādin represent an independent older branch of the Sthavira.

This is not contradicted by the fact that both belong to the same philosophical-dogmatic school, since from the first we have stressed the principle that the foundation of communities and the rise of dogmatic schools are two quite separate things. And indeed, this very instance serves to show that the school formation took place later and followed other lines than the foundation of the communities. In the accounts of the first council, which are to be found in all the Vinaya, we find information about the composition of the canon of sacred scriptures with the various schools, and these data follow case by case the canon of the school concerned. So we read [2] that the Dharmaguptaka and Haimavata possessed an Abhidharma which in its structure was akin to the Abhidharma of Śâriputra, preserved in a Chinese translation [3]. On the

1) Cf. lastly M. Hofinger, *Étude sur le concile de Vaiśālī* (Bibliothèque du Muséon, Vol. 20), Louvain 1946, above all p. 167. The same is shown to be the case with the account of the first council (cf. J. Przyluski, *Concile*), with the legend of Piṇḍola Bhāradvāja (cf. S. Lévi, *Les Seize Arhats protecteurs de la Loi*, in *J. As.*, 1916, II, pp. 232-251) etc.

2) *Ssŭ fên lü*, T 1428, ch. 54, p. 968 *b* 26 seq. and *P'i-ni mu ching*, T 1463, ch. 4, p. 818 *a* 28 seq.; cf. Ét. Lamotte, *Traité*, I, p. 112, No. 2.

3) *Shê-li-fu a-p'i-t'an lun*, T 1548.

other side, the Abhidharma of the Sarvāstivādin consisted of six different independent works [1], like the Pāli canon which includes seven different Abhidharma texts. This goes to show that the missionary school received upon their foundation the same Vinaya, but not the same Abhidharma. The latter is thus apparently younger in date. Now, in the case of the Sarvāstivādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin the position is as follows. While the Abhidharma of the Sarvāstivādin, as said above, consists of six different works, the Mūlasarvāstivādin possessed only one Mātṛkā [2]. The development of the philosophical-dogmatic Sarvāstivāda school took its move from the six works of the Abhidharma of the Sarvāstivādin. The decisive step was taken by Kātyāyanīputra with the composition of the *Jñānaprasthāna*, which he wrote, according to tradition, in the Tāmasavana-Vihāra in Uḍḍiyāna [3]. The later developments are dominated above all by the activity of the commentators, culminating in the great *Mahāvibhāṣāśāstra*, which is said to have been composed at a synod under Kaniṣka [4]. Its conclusion is represented by the works of Vasubandhu and of his great adversary Saṃghabhadra. Thus since its beginnings the philosophical-dogmatic Sarvāstivāda school has gone through all the im-

1) These works are known and are extant in translation. The council accounts in the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin and in the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* quote the beginning of the *Dharmaskandha*, which according to a widespread tradition was the first of these works (*Shih sung lü*, T. 1435, ch. 60, p. 449 *a* 20 seqq. and *Ta chih tu lun*, T 1509, ch. 2, p. 69 *c* 20 seqq.).

2) *Kṣudrakavastu*, T 1451, ch. 40, p. 408 *b* 2-11; cf. also *Divyāvadāna* p. 18, 6 and 15, 333, 7.

3) Hsüan-tsang, *Hsi yü chi*, T 2087, ch. 4, p. 889 *c* 3 seq. The tradition is uncertain (see ÉT. LAMOTTE, *Traité* I, p. 109 No. 2 *b*).

4) The tradition is collected and discussed in my paper on the Buddhist councils in *ZDMG*, 102. 1952. pp. 250-256.

portant stages of its development in Kaśmīr and the neighbouring countries [1], which are accordingly stated by tradition to have been their citadel. Thence it spread to the bordering regions and thus apparently came also to Mathurā. We can thus see here a fine example of how the rise of a school proceeded quite independently from the establishment of the communities and went its own ways. But if the Sarvāstivāda school came into existence within the missionary community of Káśmīr, it is a late one. Its diffusion doesn't allow to draw inferences about the rise of the old communities and their mutual relations. So the results hitherto obtained are not affected thereby.

According to our researches, the relationship between the two schools of the Sarvāstivādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin appears to be the following. They were at first two independent communities of different origin. Mathurā is an ancient Buddhist zone and its community goes back at least to the times of the council of Vaiśālī. Gandhāra and Kaśmīr were converted at the time of Aśoka, starting from Vidiśā. Later on both communities grew into one school through their accepting the theories of the philosophical-dogmatic Sarvāstivāda school; but they never completely lost their individualities.

These results allow us to draw important conclusions for the history of the Vinaya; and thus we come back to the question from which we started. We have seen in the foregoing chapter that the Vinaya texts of the schools issued from the missions under Aśoka, viz. of the Sarvā-

[1] Although Vasubandhu wrote his *Abhidharmakośa* in Ayodhyā, he based himself, upon his own statement (*Abh. Koś.*, VIII, v. 40), on the Kaśmīri tradition; his deviations from the orthodox teaching were corrected by the Kaśmīri Saṃghabhadra.

stivādin, Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka and of the Pāli school, are derived from one and the same Vinaya, viz. the one which was current in the Vidiśā region at the time of Aśoka and which was brought to them by the missionaries. Now we have recognized in the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin the Vinaya of a community which has nothing to do with the missions, but represents an independent early community, whose Vinaya was apparently an ancient heirloom. But this Vinaya, in spite of strong differences, shows in its structure and contents such a deep-going agreement with the works hitherto discussed, that we are bound to accept a common origin. So we come to the conclusion that the Vinaya, which the missionary communities received from the parent community in Vidiśā, was not current in Vidiśā only, but enjoyed a wide diffusion, as shown by the instance of the Mathurā community, and probably goes back to an earlier period than the times of Aśoka.

3. – The origin of the Skandhaka.

We have been able, by utilizing the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin, to take a step forward in our study of the history of the Vinaya. It would be now desirable to try to penetrate further with the help of the last work not hitherto utilized, the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika. But here we are faced with serious difficulties. This Vinaya shows, it is true, several striking ressemblances with the works discussed above; but it is so utterly different from them in its inner structure, that its position remains for the moment uncertain and it is therefore impossible to base any conclusion on it. We must therefore take another path in order to come nearer to our goal; and for this we have the following possibility.

All the Vinaya with which we are concerned, even the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika, contain an account of the two earliest Buddhist assemblies, the so-called council of Rājagṛha in which the canon of the sacred scriptures is said to have been compiled, and the council of Vaiśālī where controversial points in the disciplinary practice were discussed. It has been noticed long ago that in the Vinaya of the Pāli school, which at first was the only one to be studied, this account begins quite abruptly and that from the point of view of its content it is closely connected with the *Mahāparinibbānasuttanta* of the *Dīghanikāya*, of which it forms the continuation [1]. This fact has led Finot to the conclusion that the *Mahāparinibbānasuttanta* and

[1] H. Oldenberg, *The Vinaya Piṭaka*, Vol. I, London 1879, p. xxvi; *Buddhistische Studien*, in *ZDMG*, 52, 1896, p. 615.

the account of the councils originally formed one continuous narrative, which told in the manner of a chronicle the last days of the Buddha, his death and the beginnings of the Buddhist church [1]. And indeed several elements support the correctness of his contention. The account of the councils in the Vinaya of the Pāli school begins with Mahākāśyapa relating the unseemly utterances made by a monk on hearing the news of the death of the Buddha; he declares to take them as sufficient motive for summoning a council. These very utterances are related in the *Mahāparinibbānasuttanta*, VI, 19-20. This is certainly no chance. They are narrated in the *Mahāparinibbānasuttanta* because they are the pretext for the first council, and the account of the council can refer to them because they are inserted in the *Mahāparinibbānasuttanta*. We are thus confronted with two accounts which are correlated [2] and belong to an originally continuous narrative. Finot's conclusion seems to be warranted from this point of view. But it receives full confirmation above all from the remaining Vinayas.

The end of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* narrates how the Mallas of Kuśinagarī upon receiving the news of the death

1) L. Finot, *Textes historiques dans le Canon pāli*, in *J. As.*, 1932, II, p. 158; *Mahāparinibbānasutta and Cullavagga*, in *IHQ*, VIII, 1932, pp. 241-246. Finot's theory has found partly the approval and partly the hostility of other scholars. Favourable were E. Obermiller, *The account of the Buddha's Nirvāṇa and the first Councils according to the Vinayakṣudraka*, in *IHQ*, VIII, 1932, pp. 781-784; L. de la Vallée Poussin in *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques*, III, 1934-5, p. 370; Ét. Lamotte, *La légende du Buddha*, in *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 134, 1947-48, p. 52 seqq.; hostile were P. Demiéville, *À propos du concile de Vaiśālī*, in *T'oung Pao*, 40, 1951, pp. 251 seq.; J. Filliozat in *L'Inde Classique*, I, Paris 1947, pp. 134-135.

2) The attempt of Oldenberg to find a contradiction between the two accounts has been conclusively rejected by Finot, op. cit., p. 243.

of the Buddha carry out the preparations for the funerals, how the cremation is postponed till the arrival of Mahākāśyapa, who is on his way from Pāpā with 500 monks (this is the passage containing the disrespectful utterances of a monk), how after the arrival of Mahākāśyapa the cremation is carried out, how there is a dispute about the relics and how these are eventually divided and stūpas erected over them. Of all the Vinaya, that of the Mahīśāsaka is the only one, along with that of the Pāli school, who begins at once with the account of the councils [1]. The Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka tells us of the Mallas' preparations for the funeral, of the journey and the arrival of Mahākāśyapa and of the cremation of the corpse, and only then goes on to the narrative of the councils [2]. So does the *P'i-ni mu ching* of the Haimavata [3]. The Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin begins only with the journey of Mahākāśyapa, but then narrates also the dispute for the relics and their division [4]. The Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin and of the Mahāsāṃghika place the whole *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* before the account of the councils [5]. Thus out of the extant Vinaya, two give the account of the councils in connection with the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, three have kept before it large portions of the *Mahāpa-*

1) T 1421, ch. 30, p. 190 *b* 10 seqq.

2) T 1428, ch. 54, p. 966 *a* 12 seqq.; the narrative agrees with the corresponding section of the *Ch'ang a-han*, which also belongs to the Dharmaguptaka school (cf. T 1, ch. 4, p. 28 *b* 19 seqq.).

3) T 1463, ch. 3, p. 817 *b* 26 seqq.

4) T 1435, ch. 60, p. 445 *c* 8 seqq.

5) T 1451, ch. 35, p. 382 *b* 29-ch. 39, p. 402 *c* 4 and T 1425, ch. 32, p. 489 *c* 26-490 *b* 21. In the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika merely the first and the last sentences are given in full, while the rest is only hinted at, a common procedure in this work; but this detracts nothing from the fact that the whole Sūtra is placed before the account of the councils.

rinirvāṇasūtra and only in two the account of the councils stands alone, but still betrays by its abrupt beginning that originally it was a part of a larger context. The original continuity of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* and of the account of the councils, upheld by Finot, is thus not a conjecture, but a fact, established by tradition.

We come thus in agreement with Finot to the conclusion that the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* and the account of the councils formed in the beginning one single narrative. Now, to what place is this narrative entitled in the frame of the Buddhist tradition? Finot has suggested that it may represent an originally independent chronicle, which was included only later in the canonic collection of scriptures, and was split in two in the process. But this is a mere conjecture. The nature of the text points elsewhere. As we have already seen, this narrative is found, whole or in parts, in all the Vinaya extant. This is in favour of an old established connection. We can even give it a fixed place within the Vinaya. It has been noticed that as a rule it stands at the end of the Vinaya, and at the utmost it is followed by some addenda [1]. The only exception is the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika, in which it is joined to the discussion of the Saṃghabheda, probably for reasons of expediency. This exception carries no weight, since this very Vinaya has changed the whole structure from its foundations. The place of our narrative can, however, be settled even more precisely. As already mentioned, all the Vinaya consist of two parts, the *Sūtravibhaṅga*, the commentary on the confession for-

1) Cf. P. Demiéville, *A propos du concile de Vaiśālī*, in *T'oung Pao*, 40, 1951, pp. 245-251.

mulae of the monks and nuns; and the *Skandhaka*, the rules which regulate the life of the community; to these several appendixes are attached, like the *Parivāra* in the Vinaya of the Pāli school, or an *Ekottara* in the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka. Now it comes to light that in nearly all the Vinaya the account of the Buddha's death and of the councils stands at the end of the *Skandhaka*, before the appendixes where these exist. This is the case with the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka, of the Mahīśāsaka, of the Pāli school and of the Mūlasarvāstivādin. The Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin represents an exception. But in this work the whole sequence of the sections has undergone a change. The *Skandhaka* are inserted between the *Bhikṣuvibhaṅga* and the *Bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*. Then follows an *Ekottara*, an *Upāliparipṛcchā* and several smaller appendixes; and among these appendixes stands also our narrative. But if we disregard this lonely exception, we can say that for all the schools belonging to the Sthavira group our narrative stands at the end of the *Skandhaka*.

We can now sum up our results thus: The story of the death of the Buddha and the account of the two earliest councils formed originally one single narrative. This narrative, according to the evidence of the great majority of the sources, was a fixed component of the Vinaya. It belonged to the Vinaya already in its earliest form recognizable to us, and had its place at the end of the *Skandhaka*.

But it is deserving notice that only in a few cases this narrative is completely preserved in its original place. Its first portion, the tale of the death of the Buddha, has been in most cases cut loose and included as a Sūtra

in the collection of the Long Sūtras of the Sūtrapiṭaka [1]. We can observe a process of crumbling away, as it were.

There is an additional fact. It is well known that at the beginning of the *Skandhaka* in the Vinaya of the Pāli school there is a fragment of a biography of the Buddha [2]. The same is the case with most of the other Vinaya. We find such a fragment in the same place in the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka and of the Mahīśāsaka [3]. In the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin there is a corresponding section in the *Saṃghabhedavastu* [4]. In fact, this Vinaya has gathered everything pertaining to the life of the Buddha in the *Saṃghabhedavastu* (T 1450) and in the *Kṣudrakavastu* (T 1451), which form in it the concluding portion of the *Skandhaka*. We shall see later why this has happened. But we can still recognize that the corresponding section of the *Saṃghabhedavastu* stood originally at the beginning of the *Skandhaka*, because the concluding portion, the conversion of the Buddha's foremost disciples Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana, has hung back in that place [5]. Also the career of the Bodhisattva is at least hinted at in a few words [6]. Thus this portion of the life of the Buddha had originally its place at the beginning of the *Skandhaka* even with the Mūlasarvāstivādin. A corresponding section is completely lacking only with the

[1] It has long been recognized that in this place it bears the stamp of a foreign intrusion. See on this the conclusive remarks of M. WINTERNITZ, *Geschichte der indischen Literatur*, II, Leipzig 1920, p. 29.

[2] *Mahāvagga* I, 1-24.

[3] T 1428, ch. 31, p. 779 *a* 1 - ch. 33, p. 799 *b* 24 and T 1421, ch. 15, p. 101 *a* 6 - ch. 16, p. 110 *c* 10.

[4] T 1450, ch. 1, p. 99 *a* 14 - ch. 8, p. 137 *c* 18.

[5] T 1444, ch. 1, p. 1020 *b* 11 - ch. 2, p. 1030 *b* 15.

[6] T 1444, ch. 1, p. 1020 *c* 14 seqq. and ch. 2, p. 1026 *c* 20 seqq.

Sarvāstivādin and the Mahāsāṃghika. We can therefore say that according to the majority of the sources a portion of a biography of the Buddha stood originally at the head of the *Skandhaka*.

Turning to the size of this text, in the Vinaya of the Pāli school it begins with the Illumination, includes the sermon of Benares and the first successes of the Buddha as far as the conversion of Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana. The Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka and Mahīśāsaka, on the contrary, contain the beginning of a complete biography of the Buddha, beginning with his lineage. The same is the case with the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin, with the only difference that it takes the tale even farther back and begins with the origin of mankind. What is the reason of this difference? Why appears this text complete in some sources, while it is totally missing in others?

After our findings in the case of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, we are tempted to see here too a process of crumbling away, the more so inasmuch as we can observe in the Vinaya of the Pāli school the same abrupt beginning of the narrative as in the account of the first council. And indeed this supposition stands confirmed. Firstly, the lack of a corresponding section in the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin finds in this way its explanation. The publication by E. Waldschmidt of some texts of the Prussian expedition to Turfan has shown that the Sarvāstivādin possessed an account, which in contents and size agreed exactly with this section in the Vinaya of the Pāli school [1].

[1] Cf. E. Waldschmidt, *Vergleichende Analyse des Catuṣpariṣatsūtra*. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 7, *Beiträge zur indischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, Walter Schubring zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht*, Hamburg 1951, pp. 84-122; also *Das Catuṣpariṣatsūtra auf Grund von Turfan-Handschriften*

But with them this account did not belong to the Vinaya, but was inserted under the name of *Catuṣpariṣatsūtra* in the *Dīrghāgama* of the Sūtrapiṭaka. This is exactly the same process as with the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* and we can therefore take for granted that this account too belonged, as in the majority of the sources, to the Vinaya, and more precisely it stood at the beginning of the *Skandhaka*. The supposition of a crumbling away process seems thus to be justified.

But how does it happen, that the account in the Vinaya of the Pāli school as well as the *Catuṣpariṣatsūtra* of the Sarvāstivādin begins abruptly with the events after the Illumination? If this too is a case of crumbling away, what has happened to the complete account? In order to answer this question we have to recall the following points. We have a number of biographies of the Buddha, which narrate his life from his birth to the beginning of his teaching activity and then stop suddenly [1]. The best known of them are the *Nidānakathā* at the beginning of the Jātaka collection of the Pāli school, the *Lalitavistara* and the *Mahāvastu*. We feel compelled to ask why they are incomplete. This can be explained on the supposition that they have come into being through the incomplete biographies of the Buddha at the beginning of the *Skandhaka* being cut loose and becoming independent. Their very limits are in favour of this, since they end at the same point of the narrative as the account in the *Skandhaka*, or at the utmost they carry it on a little farther.

herausgegeben und bearbeitet, Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, 1952, No. 2.

1) Cf. Ét. Lamotte, *La légende du Buddha*, in *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 134, 1947-48, p. 37 seq.

Besides, some of them are expressly included in the Vinaya, and this would be incomprehensible if there were no close connection. Lastly we have the following important piece of evidence. At the end of one of these biographies, the *Fo pên hsing chi ching* (T 190, ch. 60, p. 932 *a* 16-21) there is the following item:

"Question: How is this Sūtra called? Reply: The teachers of the Mahāsāṃghika call it *Ta shih* (*Mahāvastu*), the teachers of the Sarvāstivādin call it *Ta chuang yen* (*Mahālalitavistara*), the teachers of the Kāśyapīya call it *Fo shêng yin yüan* (*Buddhajātakanidāna*), the teachers of the Dharmaguptaka call it *Shih-chia-mou-ni fo pên hsing* (*Śākyamunibuddhacarita*), the teachers of the Mahīśāsaka call it *P'i-ni tsang kên pên* (*Vinayapiṭakamūla*) ".

In this passage the above mentioned texts and some others are enumerated, and all are joined into a group. This shows that they were all reckoned as belonging to the same stratum of tradition and were considered as related. Most important is the following consideration. The schools listed above are the same which another tradition, already quoted above on p. 11, lists as Vinaya schools. The same schools, therefore, which distinguished themselves by their study of the Vinaya and could boast of a Vinaya of their own, possessed also such an incomplete biography of the Buddha. This cannot be a mere chance; it places the connection beyond doubt. We can thus safely assume that these incomplete biographies of the Buddha arose from the growing independence of the incomplete biographies from the beginning of the *Skandhaka*.

To this evidence we may add the following remarks. The mention of a *Jātakanidāna* with the Kāśyapīya school shows that the biography of the Buddha, having become

independent, could be connected also with the collection of the Jātaka. This authorizes us to attribute the *Nidāna-kathā* of the Pāli school to this group of works, even if this school is not expressly mentioned here, as it is not in the tradition of the parent country. Another important element is that among the works listed above there is one which is attributed to the Mahāsāṃghika school, viz. the *Mahāvastu*. This proves that the Vinaya of this school too contained originally the beginning of a biography of the Buddha, which later was lost because of the process of crumbling already described. Since this Vinaya includes, as seen above, also the account of the death of the Buddha and of the earliest councils, we may assume that it too originally showed the same composition as the other texts which we are studying, and that its radical regrouping of the materials is only secondary. This supposition will be confirmed later on. In any case we feel justified, in view of these circumstances, to utilize in the course of our researches the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika in the same measure as the Vinaya of the other schools.

Summing up, we obtain the following picture: All the Vinaya with which we are concerned contained originally at the beginning of the *Skandhaka* a portion of a biography of the Buddha from his birth to the beginning of his teaching activity; we can assume that this was the case also for the basic text from which the Vinaya were derived. In the course of time this biography became independent and was further developped by the various schools. The independent works, which came into being in this way, were partly reckoned as belonging to the Vinaya. This is proved for the Mahīśāsaka school by the name *Vinayapiṭakamūla*, for the Mahāsāṃghika school by the direct

evidence of the tradition [1]. Occasionally they were coupled also with the Jātaka collection, as it was the case with the Kāśyapīya and the Pāli schools. The independence of the biography and its development into works in their own right carried with itself the consequence that the original text in the *Skandhaka* lost its interest. And then it partly crumbled away, as with the Sarvāstivādin and the Pāli school. It has completely disappeared from the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika. This development is valid for all the schools with which we are concerned. Only the school of the Mūlasarvāstivādin went its own ways and gathered everything belonging to the biography of the Buddha at the end of the *Skandhaka*.

Now we can proceed to select from the results hitherto obtained those which carry weight for the history of the origin of the Vinaya, in order to draw our conclusions. We have seen that at the beginning of the earliest *Skandhaka* work, from which all the extant Vinaya drew, there was a biography of the Buddha from his birth to the beginning of his teaching activity. We have also seen that the concluding portion of this work was formed by an account of the death of the Buddha and of the two earliest councils. This means that the core of the work, the exposition of the Buddhist monastic rules, was enclosed by a biography of the Buddha. Nor was this framework a mere embellishment. It is well known that the *Skandhaka* do not give the monastic rules as a collection of precepts, but in the form of an historical account. They narrate the events which gave occasion to the single rules, and we

[1] *āryamahāsāṃghikānāṃ lokottaravādināṃ madhyadeśikānāṃ pāṭhena vinayapiṭakasya mahāvastuye ādi* (*Mahāvastu*, ed. É. Senart, 1. p. 2, 13).

are told how the Buddha thereupon promulgated these rules. The exposition of the rules appears thus in the form of a current narrative of the activity of the Buddha. This character is still more strengthened by the insertion, at shorter or larger intervals, of legends which give more life to the narrative. Thus the core of the work melts together with the framework into a great unity. It begins with the account of the career of the Buddha upto the Illumination. Then follows the tale of his activity, which, after the fundamental sermon of Benares and the first conversions, consists mainly in the foundation and organization of the monastic order, in accordance with the purpose of the text. The conclusion is formed by the account of the last days and the death of the Buddha. If we take into account also the imposing and clear distribution of the subject matter, which distinguishes the *Skandhaka*, we can safely state that we have here a work sketched and carried out according to a great plan. The Buddhistic monastic rules, as we have them in the *Skandhaka*, are not a collection of precepts, as it could have arisen in the course of time in the midst of the community, but a work which was consciously created in accordance with an imposing plan; it is quite different from the loose collections of old traditions, as contained in the Sūtrapiṭaka. Since this work must have been created considerable time before Aśoka, it is the earliest Buddhist literary work whose existance we have hitherto been able to ascertain.

Thus our enquiry on the origin and history of the Vinaya has come to a first conclusion. We have recognized as origin and source of the *Skandhaka* a work, which was composed before Aśoka and from which all the extant

Vinaya works drew their contents. Now we must determine, with as much precision as it is possible, the place and time of the creation of this work, and if possible also give an explanation of its rise.

I do not wish to waste much space on the home of the work. It is determined by the geographical range of view in which the events unroll themselves. The traditions of the various schools are responsible for many modifications, but it is clear enough that this range of view does not overstep very much the old home of Buddhism with the centres of Rājagṛha, Śrāvastī and Kauśāmbī. In any case this will be a fruitful field for further investigation.

The time of the work can be settled with a fair amount of certainty, after all that we have said above. We have already seen that it must have come into being some time before Aśoka. As in the meantime we have ascertained that the Mahāsāṃghika school too has drawn from this work, we must shift it into the time before the first schisma, which separated the Mahāsāṃghika from the Sthavira. On the other side it must have been composed after the council of Vaiśālī, which is narrated in all recensions. And thus, if we stick to the most usual traditional dates, its rise belongs to the period between 100 and 160 after the Nirvāṇa.

We come now to the last question. How was it that a work so grandly planned and so peculiar in its central structure came into being? In order to answer this question we must turn our attention above all to the accounts of the councils. They appear to be superfluous in the light of the plan of the work described above. The idea of inserting in the frame-work of a biography the precepts

given by the Buddha to the monk community in the course of his life, is indeed obvious enough. But what is the use of the accounts of the councils at the end of this biography? In order to eliminate this difficulty we are going to consider in some detail these accounts in all the versions that have come down to us. For our enquiry has already shown that the deformation of single sources can very easily distort the picture and lead to false consequences.

In the first place we notice that in the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin, Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka and of the Pāli school the accounts of the two councils follow immediately each other. There is nothing to keep them apart. But also every connection is lacking. Things are different in the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin and of the Mahāsāṃghika. Here the description of the first council is followed in the case of the Mūlasarvāstivādin by a kind of history of the patriarchs [1], in the case of the Mahāsāṃghika by a list of teachers [2], and only then, without further connection, there follows the account of the second council. We stand thus before the question whether this central portion is an early component of the text or not. Now we notice again and again that just the two schools of the Mūlasarvāstivādin and of the Mahāsāṃghika have introduced great modifications in their Vinaya, but at the same time have preserved a good deal of ancient material. It could be possible that the same applies to this case too, that these lists of patriarchs or of teachers may be an old component of the work, and

1) T 1451, p. 408 *b* 26-411 *c* 3; for the greater part translated by J. PRZYLUSKI, *Le Nord-Ouest de l'Inde*, pp. 322-537.

2) T 1425, ch. 32, pp. 492 *c* 17-493 *a* 19; translated by J. PRZYLUSKI, *Concile*, pp. 217-219.

that they were lost in the other schools merely by a process of crumbling away, such as we have noticed already several times. This is, however, only a possibility and it would be dangerous to draw from it far-going consequences. But luckily we are in a position to show that the text originally must have shown a similar aspect also with other schools. We owe the possibility of this proof to the Pāli school, which disposes of richer materials than the others.

But before we turn to the Pāli school itself, we must consider in detail the position of the Mūlasarvāstivādin. With them the concluding portion of the *Skandhaka* is composed as follows. The *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (T 1451, pp. 382 *b* 29-402 *c* 4) is followed by the account of the first council (pp. 402 *c* 5-408 *b* 25). Then the Nirvāṇa of Mahākāśyapa and of Ānanda is narrated in detail (pp. 408 *b* 26-409 *c* 8 and 409 *c* 8-411 *a* 5) [1]. Thereupon follows a short enumeration of the next patriarchs, Śaṇika (Śāṇavāsa), Upagupta, Dhītika, Kṛṣṇa and Sudarśana (pp. 411 *b* 18-411 *c* 3). The account of the second council (pp. 411 *c* 3-414 *b* 11), loosely connected, follows at the end.

This scheme coincides in large measure with that of another text, which we have mentioned in the preceding chapter, viz. the church history of Mathurā contained in the *Aśokarājasūtra* [2]. Its narrative is along the following lines. It begins with a short account of the last journey of the Buddha and his Nirvāṇa (*A-yü wang chuan*, T 2042, pp. 111 *b* 27-112 *b* 14; *A-yü wang ching*, T. 2043, pp. 149 *b*

[1] The Madhyāntika episode, having been recognized as an interpolation (see above pp. 28 seqq.), has been utilized neither here nor in the church history.

[2] See supra p. 33 seqq.

19-150 *b* 17; *Divyāvadāna* pp. 348, 20-350, 25)[1]. Then follows the first council (T 2042, pp. 112 *b* 14-114 *a* 25; T 2043, pp. 150 *b* 17-152 *c* 8), the Nirvāṇa of Mahākāśyapa (T 2042, pp. 114 *a* 26-115 *b* 3; T 2043, pp. 153 *a* 5-154 *b* 9) and the Nirvāṇa of Ānanda (T 2042, pp. 115 *b* 3-116 *b* 10; T 2043, pp. 154 *b* 9-156 *a* 5). These are followed by the legend, told in grand detail, of the two local saints of Mathurā, Śāṇavāsa and Upagupta (T 2042, pp. 116 *c* 19-126 *a* 20; T 2043, pp. 156 *b* 20-169 *b* 27; *Divyāvadāna*, pp. 350, 24-364, 10). The work closes with a short mention of the next patriarch Dhītika (T 2042, pp. 126 *a* 21-126 *b* 15; T 2043, pp. 169 *b* 28-169 *c* 29).

The similarity of this narrative to that in the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin is self-evident. The sequence of the events is the same. The patriarch series of both is the series of the patriarchs of Mathurā. Lastly, in the accounts of the first council, of the Nirvāṇa of Mahākāśyapa and of the Nirvāṇa of Ānanda the agreement even in detail is so striking, that the surmise of a common origin cannot be avoided. The most essential difference is that in the church history the story of the local saints of Mathurā is related in such detail and fills so much space, that it forms the greater part of the work and the bulk of its contents. All this can be best explained by assuming that the church history of Mathurā arose from the church history of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin through a fusion with the legend of the local saints of Mathurā.

We are here concerned again with a case, in which a part of the old *Skandhaka* work has been made independent and has been changed into a separate work. In this case

1) Cf. also T 2042, p. 102 *b* 13-22; T 2043, p. 135 *b* 14-26; *Divyāvadāna*, p. 385, 3-16; *Tsa a-han*, T 99, p. 165 *b* 21-*c* 4 and p. 177 *b* 12-19.

the point of departure was the form which the old work had received in the school of the Mūlasarvāstivādin and which is extant in the Vinaya of this school. And here we can see at close distance how this process of getting independent took place. The last journey of the Buddha and his Nirvāṇa, from which the narrative starts but which are of minor importance for the church history, are related very shortly and undergo a characteristic transformation. Thus the journey of the Buddha is deviated to Mathurā, and this gives the occasion for attributing to him a prophecy about Mathurā and its patriarchs. The general portion of the church history, which does not concern Mathurā alone, is simply taken over from the basic work. But then, when the narrative passes on to the patriarchs of Mathurā itself, it becomes detailed and copious and follows lines quite of its own, so that this becomes the essential and largest part of the whole work.

Among the works of the Pāli school we find now a text, which in its structure shows a striking similarity to the church history of Mathurā. The Singhalese chronicles *Dīpavaṃsa* and *Mahāvaṃsa* and the historical introduction to Buddhaghosa's *Samantapāsādikā* contain a portion of a church history of the parent community, from where the mission to Ceylon started [1]. This became in Ceylon the point of departure of the Singhalese church history and has thereby been preserved for us. It begins with the first council (*Dīp.*, IV, v. 1-26 and V, v. 1-14; *Mah.*, III; *Sam.*, pp. 4, 6-31, 12), adds to it a list of patriarchs (*Dīp.*, IV, vv. 27-46 and V, vv. 69-107; *Mah.*, V, vv. 107-132; *Sam.*, pp. 31, 13-33, 6), describes the second council

[1] This will be discussed in detail later on.

(*Dīp.*, IV, vv. 47-53 and V, vv. 15-29; *Mah.*, IV, vv. 9-65; *Sam.*, pp. 33, 7-35, 5)[1] and then narrates in detail the story of the head of the school of the parent community, Tissa Moggaliputta, his young age (*Dīp.*, V, vv. 55-68; *Mah.*, V, vv. 98-106 and vv. 133-155; *Sam.*, pp. 35, 8-41, 20), the council in which he played a leading role (*Dīp.*, VII, vv. 34-43 and vv. 44-59; *Mah.*, V, vv. 230-282; *Sam.*, pp. 52, 20-61, 25) and the sending out of the missions, which is attributed to his initiative (*Dīp.*, VIII; *Mah.*, XII; *Sam.*, pp. 63, 20-69, 15). Then the account from the home country remains interrupted, because with the missions the church history of Ceylon begins.

The similarity of this account with the church history of Mathurâ is unmistakable. Here as well as there the narrative begins with the death of the Buddha, speaks first of the councils and goes on, through a relatively short history of the patriarchs, to the history of the real school founder, which is treated in great detail. This similarity warrants the supposition that this text too has come into existence from a fusion of the account of the councils and of the history of the patriarchs in the Vinaya with the legend of the own school founder. This suspicion is turned into certainty by what follows. As the works of the Mūlasarvāstivādin and Mahāsāṃghika lead us to recognize, the account of the first council stood in the first place in the Vinaya, then there followed the list of the patriarchs and only then the second council. The second council stands so to say outside the connection, and its insertion causes difficulties. And since it is not essential for the course

1) I did not take into account the section on the rise of the Buddhist schools (*Dīp.*, V, vv. 30-54; *Mah.*, V, vv. 1-13), because in my opinion it does not belong to the early nucleus of the church history.

of events, it is omitted in the church history of Mathurā. In the church history of the Pāli school this did not happen. Here it has been kept, and what is more important, in the same place as in the Vinaya, after the list of patriarchs. And here too, as in the Vinaya, it is but loosely connected. Characteristically, none of the patriarchs appears among the chairmen of the second council. And yet the compilers of this church history were by no means adverse to try to obtain a closer union between the single parts of their work. This is shown by the fact that the legend of Tissa Moggaliputta is prepared by a prophecy after the second council and is attached to it. Thus we are justified in considering the sequence: first council, list of patriarchs, second council, and the abrupt addition of the second council as a characteristic point of agreement between the church history of the Pāli school and the narrative in the Vinaya; and we can therefore conclude that this part of the church history is drawn from the Vinaya. This leads to the further inference that also the Vinaya of the Pāli school originally included between the two accounts of the councils a list of patriarchs, which later was lost through crumbling away. And the same may be assumed also for the Vinaya of the other missionary schools.

Thus the list of patriarchs stands recognized as a component of the ancient *Skandhaka* work; we can now return to our first question, why this work did not stop with the death of the Buddha and went on with the account of the two councils and the list of patriarchs. In order to answer this question, we must take into account the following point. The Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin and of the Pāli school alone contain a real list of patriarchs; the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika has in its place a list

of teachers which handed down the text to posterity. The latter seems to be the original one. In the first place the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika in several places shows peculiar archaic features. But above all it is easily understood how a series of unimportant and soon forgotten teachers was discarded in favour of well known patriarchs [1], while the contrary is hard to conceive. But then things gain another complexion. The list of teachers in the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika is strikingly akin to the list of teachers in Vedic works. It is said in the Vinaya (T 1425, ch. 32, p. 492 c 17 seqq.): "From whom did we hear this teaching? From the venerable Tao-li have we heard the Vinaya, the Abhidharma, the *Saṃyuktāgama*, the *Ekottarikāgama*, the *Madhyamāgama* and the *Dīrghāgama*. From whom did Tao-li hear them? From the venerable Fu-sha-p'o-t'o-lo. From whom did the venerable Fu-sha-p'o-t'o-lo hear them? From the venerable Fa-shêng... etc. till... From whom did T'o-so-p'o-lo hear them? From the venerable Upāli. From whom did Upāli hear them? From the Buddha. From whom did the Buddha hear them? He realized them himself without a teacher and did not hear them from another. The Buddha possessed boundless knowledge." This is exactly similar e.g. to the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad* (II, 6): "Now the series (of the teachers). (We have it) from Pautimāṣya, Pautimāṣya from Gaupavana, Gaupavana from Pautimāṣya... etc. till... Sanātana from Sanaga, Sanaga from Parameṣṭhī, Parameṣṭhī from Brahma. The Brahma is self-existent.

[1] The text of the list of patriarchs in the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin lays particular stress on the transmission of the teaching by the patriarchs. This reminds us of the teachers of the "list of teachers", who handed down the sacred texts.

Honour to the Brahma!" The structure and form of the two lists are the same. In the one case the exposition of the teaching is taken back through a long series of teachers to the omniscient Buddha, in the other case to the self-existing Brahman. The only difference is that the Vedic text, for which the lists of teacher are a quite common feature, gives his list abbreviated in a formula. The Buddhist text, which thereby introduces in its domain something quite new, gives it in archaic fullness. In my opinion, therefore, the list of teachers of the Vinaya was created on the pattern of and as a counterpart to the Vedic lists of teachers, in order to bestow on the own tradition an authority similar to the Vedic one.

We may be at first surprised in seeing an ancient Buddhist text influenced by Vedic models; but on closer scrutiny this is not at all unlikely and finds plenty of corroboration. As we have seen in the course of our enquiry, the old *Skandhaka* work has come into being in the 4th century B. C., that is at a time when the Vedic literature was still fully alive. S. Lévi has come to the same conclusion from another starting point. He has shown in one of his most brilliant articles that the beginnings of the Buddhist literature belong to a time when the Vedic accentuation was still in use, i. e. to the time of the latest Vedic literature [1]. Since he supports his contention from texts which are taken from the *Skandhaka*, they confirm most happily our conclusions on the age of this work. There being a living contact with the Vedic literature, influences were quite in the order. Besides, S. Lévi has collected in the same paper some texts from

[1] S. Lévi, *Sur la récitation primitive des textes bouddhiques*, in *J. As.*, 1915, I, pp. 401-447; cf. specially pp. 446 seq.

the *Skandhaka*, which discuss the question whether the Buddhist texts ought to be recited in the same manner as the texts of the Veda. Here the influence of the V dic model is palpable. Thus the situation is given, which was implied in our theory of the origin of the teachers' list in the Vinaya. If, in fact, there was a tendency to shape the recitation of the texts on the Vedic pattern, then an attempt could also be made to guarantee the validity of the tradition through the addition of a list of teachers, and thus to give to the own works an authority similar to that of the Vedas.

But the influence of the Vedic model explains many things more. It is a common custom in the Vedic literature not simply to describe a sacrificial act, but to narrate how it was performed for the first time. In the same way the Upaniṣads are not contented with expounding a teaching, but in most cases they tell us how on such and such an occasion it was propounded by a famous teacher. If the Vinaya does not simply lay down the rules for the monastic community, but tells us how and on what occasion the Buddha gave the various precepts, this apparently goes also back to the Vedic model.

Let us go one step farther. When the Upaniṣads place a text in the mouth of a famous teacher, this has the purpose of placing it under his authority. According to the credence of that epoch, the texts do not speak for themselves, but the authority of their propounder speaks for them. In many cases, as e. g. with the libation ceremony (*Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad*, VI, 1-3), we find a list of teachers added, which effects the connection with the propounder and guarantees the credibility of the given teaching. The series of teachers at the end of Vedic

works have the same purpose. They create the connection with the holy seers, who are accepted as propounders of the works and guarantee their credibility. But the author of a Buddhist work, wishing to bestow on it greater credibility by the addition of a list of teachers on the Vedic pattern, stumbled here on a difficulty. The authority, on which all validity reposes, was for him the Buddha. But it was impossible to attribute all his work to the Buddha and to attach to him the teachers' list, because the Buddha had delivered only individual sermons and given individual precepts; and it was impossible to annex a list of teachers to every single one of them. In the Skandhaka this difficulty is put out of the way by the account of the councils before the list of teachers. Through that account all the single precepts, which the Buddha as described in the work delivered in the course of his life, are gathered together in a whole and placed under the authority of his direct disciples, who are witness that they really come from the Master's mouth. The list of teachers attaches itself to this authority, leads the work back to it and in this way guarantees its authenticity. Only in this way the account of the first council can be really understood. It was always agreed that it could not be an historical event. There may have been early attempts to collect the word of the Buddha, but a council in this form immediately after his death is unthinkable. On the other side it was not clear to which purpose such an invention could serve. Everything now becomes comprehensible. This council has been invented in order to place the own holy tradition under a common authority, to which recourse could be made through a list of teachers on the Vedic model. In this way we can explain both

the redaction of the old *Skandhaka* work in the form of a biography of the Buddha and the account of councils and list of teachers at the end of the work.

We have to imagine the rise of the old *Skandhaka* work about on the following lines. In the 4th century B. C. some outstanding specialist of the Vinaya undertook to collect in a definitive form the Buddhist monastic rules. He did not limit himself to collecting the material and giving it a clear arrangement, but tried also to put it in a form which would make his work the equal of the great Vedic texts. He placed the single precepts in the mouth of the Buddha, enlivened the exposition in the manner of the Brāhmaṇa texts through inserted legends and knitted the whole into a solid unity, by embedding it into the framework of a biography of the Buddha. Moreover, in order to bestow on his work the same sanctity as was attached to the Vedic texts which were attributed to the great seers of yore, he invented the legend of the first council, in which the foremost disciples of the Buddha were said to have collected in an authoritative form the words of the Master immediately after his death, and he led his work back to this collection through a list of teachers. In this way he created a work planned and executed on a large scale, which had no rivals in the Buddhist literature of the time and well deserved to be placed to the side of the Vedic texts, and even surpassed them by the logicity of its structure and by its striking framework.

Our enquiry on the source of the extant *Skandhaka* texts has come to an end. We have only one more particular to add. We have hitherto spoken of the first council alone, and have given reasons for the inclusion of its account in the old *Skandhaka* text. But all the extant

works include also another account, about the so-called council of Vaiśālī [1]; accordingly, we have to answer the question, what is the origin of this account and what is its purpose. Upon a preliminary examination of the tradition, we notice that this section is added without any connection to the first council or to the list of teachers. Since with these two the *Skandhaka* work is already concluded, our account can be at once recognized as an addendum. On the other side it is an integrant part of the tradition, since it is found with all the schools. This is only possible, if it has been included in the work at a very early time, in any case before the first schisma. It must be attributed therefore to the author of the old *Skandhaka* work himself, or a least it was added shortly after the composition of the work. But what was the reason for this addition? There are two possibilities. Either it is an invention, or an historical account. For an invention of this kind I cannot find any cogent reason. On the contrary, everything becomes clear once we admit that a real event is at the basis of the account. If really a dispute, like the one there described, broke out on important points of the monastic rules, and if it was settled by an assembly of the community, then indeed a large and comprehensive Vinaya text had good reasons for giving an account of this dispute and of the decisions given. And in view of the plan and structure of the *Skandhaka* work,

[1] *Shih sung lü*, T 1435, ch. 60, pp. 450 *a* 27-456 *b* 8; *Ssŭ fên lü*, T 1428, ch. 54, pp. 968 *c* 18-971 *c* 2; *Wu fên lü*, T 1421, ch. 30, pp. 192 *a* 26-194 *b* 20; Pāli Vinaya, *Cullavagga*, XII; Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin, *Kṣudrakavastu*, T 1451, ch. 40, pp. 411 *c* 3-414 *b* 11; *Mo-ho-sêng-ch'i lü*, T 1425, ch. 33, p. 439 *a* 25-*c* 11; *P'i-ni mu ching*, T 1463, ch. 4, p. 819 *b* 1-*c* 12. For all these texts cf. above all M. HOFINGER, *Étude sur le concile de Vaiśālī* (Bibliothèque du Muséon, vol. 20), Louvain 1946.

which had enclosed the whole remaining material within the frame of a biography of the Buddha, such an account could only be added as an appendix. I think, therefore, that the account of the second council is based on a real event. And in fact the historical-looking character of this account has been often pointed out [1]. The description of the proceedings, of the intrigues on both sides, looks quite realistic, without any embellishment. Inventions usually have another aspect. There was, however, one condition to the admission of this account in the *Skandhaka* text. It should have at that time an actual significance, in order that the communication of the decisions agreed might appear desirable in this work. The events described must, therefore, belong to a period shortly before the composition of the work, if we admit that the account belongs to its original core. If we admit that the events took place later and that the account was added afterwards, this can have happened only a short while after the composition of the work, because only in this way the account could become a solid component of the work and pass along in all the versions of the latter. This enables us to reach an even closer approximation in the datation of the old *Skandhaka* text. It must have been composed shortly before or after the second council. And since the tradition places this event in the year 100 or 110 after the Nirvāṇa, the composition must go back to about 100 years after the Nirvāṇa, that is in the first half of the 4th century B. C.

[1] Cf. M. Hofinger, *op. cit.*, pp. 152 seq.

4. – Structure and contents of the old Skandhaka text.

The conclusion that the old *Skandhaka* text is a work of Buddhist literature from the first half of the 4th century B. C., is of fundamental importance and is apt to throw new light upon the most different aspects of the earliest Buddhism. But before we proceed to draw further consequences from this conclusion, let us try to gain a more precise picture of the old text itself.

The following analysis is intended to provide such a picture, of course only in the main outlines. It is not conceived as an attempt at reconstruction, nor as a complete concordance. Both would require a special and bulky study. I shall limit myself to reproducing the chief points of the contents of the work, in its hypothetical original sequence; and I shall indicate where the sections concerned are to be found in the extant versions [1].

The sequence of the chapters is that which seems to me the most probable one. For the first half of the work it is as good as certain. Toward the end we notice a greater uncertainty of the various versions. But it is manifest, that again and again several chapters form groups of the same content and consequently must be put together. Concerning the contents of the single chapters, the tradition of the single versions is clear and its tale is simple wherever it treats few important points in a clear sequence.

[1] Also the oscillations in the proper names are usually disregarded. I employ the more usual and well-known names in their Sanskrit form. Only where the Sanskrit tradition is of no help, I employ the Pāli forms.

Where numerous unimportant precepts are marshalled together, we notice very strong differences, often even a perfect confusion. Since in such cases the interest of the contents is a minor one, I have limited myself to merely assembling a few large groups. The inserted legends occur mostly in all versions in their place. Greater deviations are seldom to be found and do not give rise to serious problems. I shall speak but briefly of the enclosing story, the biography of the Buddha as well as the accounts of the councils, since they have already been discussed in large special works dedicated to them; besides, I shall return to them later in a special chapter.

The old Skandhaka text.
Introduction: The life career of the Buddha.

(S: —; Dh. 1. *Shou chieh chien-tu*, pp. 779 *a* 1-799 *b* 24; M: 1. *Shou chieh fa*, pp. 101 *a* 6-110 *c* 10; P: 1. *Mahākhandhaka*, *Mahāvagga*, I, 1-24; Ms: 17. *Saṃghabhedavastu*, T 1450, pp. 99 *a* 14-137 *c* 18 and 1. *Pravrajyāvastu*, T 1444, pp. 1020 *b* 11-1030 *b* 15; Gilgit Manuscripts, Vol. III, Part 4, pp. 6-25; Mhs: —).

1. Antecedents. The genealogy of the Buddha (Rājavaṃśa) (S: — ; Dh: p. 779 *a* 5-*b* 10; M: p. 101 *a* 10-*b* 20; P: — ; Ms: pp. 99 *a* 18-106 *b* 6; Mhs: —).

2. The birth of the Buddha. His life till the Illumination (S: — ; Dh: pp. 779 *b* 10-781 *c* 11; M: pp. 101 *b* 20-102 *c* 21; P: — ; Ms: pp. 106 *b* 6-124 *c* 27; Mhs: —).

3. From the Illumination to the conversion of Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana (*Catuṣpariṣatsūtra*) (S: — ; Dh:

pp. 781 *c* 11-799 *b* 24; M: pp. 102 *c* 21-110 *c* 10; P: *Mahāvagga*, I, 1-24; Ms: pp. 124 *c* 28-137 *c* 18 and pp. 1020 *b* 11-1030 *b* 15, further pp. 6,13-25,11; Mhs: —)[1].

1. – Pravrajyāvastu

(S: 1. *Shou chü chü chieh fa*, pp. 148 *a* 1-157 *c* 28; Dh: 1. *Shou chieh chien–tu*, pp. 799 *b* 25-816 *c* 4; M: 1. *Shou chieh fa*, pp. 110 *c* 11-121 *a* 26; P: 1. *Mahākhandaka*, *Mahāvagga*, I, 25-79; Ms: 1. *Pravrajyāvastu* (*Ch'u chia shih*), T 1444, pp. 1030 *b* 15-1041 *a* 21; *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. III, part 4, pp. 27-68; Mhs: *Tsa sung po ch'ü fa*, pp. 412 *b* 21-422 *a* 8 and pp. 457 *b* 23-461 *b* 19).

The first four chapters of the work have as subject the fundamental institutions, which give its characteristics to the life of the Buddhist order: the admission to the order, the monthly confession ceremonies, the three months of retreat during the rains and the Pravāraṇā ceremony at the end of the rainy season.

They begin with the rules for the admission in the order. These extend not only to the admission (*pravrajyā*) and the ordination (*upasampadā*) themselves, but include also the admission of novices (*śramaṇera*), the subordination (*niśraya*) of young and inexpert monks under a master (*upādhyāya*) or teacher (*ācārya*), and treat above all of the numerous cases in which admission to the order is forbidden. The manifold contents and great bulk of this

[1] On the particulars of this section cf. E. WALDSCHMIDT, *Vergleichende Analyse des Catuṣpariṣatsūtra* (Alt-und Neu-Indische Studien 7, *Beiträge zur indischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, Walther Schubring zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht*, Hamburg 1951, pp. 84-122).

chapter have caused the single sections in the various versions to be greatly mixed up. But the text itself is essentially the same, with the exception of the usual deviations due to different traditions and of isolated amplifications and developments. We obtain about the following picture.

After the first successful conversions performed by the Buddha, it comes to light that the young monks give offence through their unseemly behaviour. Upon this the Buddha lays down that the younger monks must subordinate themselves as disciples (*sārdhavihārī*) to an older monk as master (*upādhyāya*). Master and disciple should consider themselves as father and son (S: pp. 148 *a* 4-*b* 12 and *b* 23-26; Dh: p. 799 *b* 25-*c* 7; M: p. 110 *c* 11-28; P: I, 25, 1-6; Ms: — ; Mhs: —). He prescribes in which form the junior monk must beg the senior to accept him as disciple (S: p. 149 *c* 4-10; Dh: p. 799 *c* 7-12; M: pp. 110 *c* 29-111 *a* 4; P: I, 25, 7; Ms: — ; Mhs: —). He regulates the duties of the disciple towards the master (S: p. 148 *b* 21; Dh: pp. 801 *a* 16-803 *a* 18; M: p. 111 *a* 5-29; P: I, 25, 8-24; Ms: pp. 1030 *c* 4-1031 *a* 1; Mhs: pp. 459 *a* 10-460 *a* 28) and the duties of the master towards the disciple (S: p. 148 *b* 17-21; Dh: pp. 800 *b* 29-801 *a* 16; M: p. 111 *a* 29-*b* 1; P: I, 26; Ms: — ; Mhs: pp. 458 *b* 2-459 *a* 10). Lastly he determines the punishment of disciples who behave unbecomingly toward their master (S: — ; Dh: p. 804 *a* 22-*c* 22; M: p. 113 *b* 19-*c* 25; P: I, 27; Ms: — ; Mhs: —).

Under these prescriptions of the Buddha, even junior monks accept disciples. The case of the monk Upasena, who accepts a disciple although he himself has been a monk for one year only, causes the Buddha to lay down that monks may accept disciples only after 10 years

(S: pp. 148 *b* 27-149 *a* 9; Dh: p. 800 *a* 1-*b* 6 and 803 *b* 10-*c* 3; M: p. 114 *a* 13-21; P: I, 31, 3-5; Ms: p. 1031 *a* 6-25; Mhs: p. 457 *b* 25-*c* 12). Then he prohibites incapable monks to accept disciples (S: p. 149 *a* 10-*b* 8; Dh: p. 800 *b* 6-29 and 803 c 3-23; M: p. 114 *a* 27-*c* 7; P: I, 31, 6-8 and 35; Ms: — ; Mhs: —) and enumerates groups of 5, 6 or 10 qualities each, which render a monk capable or incapable of admitting somebody to the order, or of accepting him as disciple or of making him a novice (S: p. 149 *b* 8-*c* 3; Dh: p. 806 *b* 1-*c* 9; M: p. 114 *c* 8-29; P: I, 36, 2-17 and 37; Ms: p. 1031 *a* 25-*c* 11; Mhs: p. 457 *c* 12-24).

Since upon being left without a master, because of his absence, leaving the order, or of his death, the disciples become again a nuisance through their bad behaviour, the Buddha prescribes that in such cases another elder monk shall take the place of the master in quality of teacher (*ācārya*) and that the disciple shall be subject to him as a pupil (*antevāsī*). The regulations for the form in which the pupil declares himself subject to the teacher, for their mutual duties etc. are quite similar to those laid down for master and disciple (S: —[1]; Dh: p. 803 *a* 24-*b* 10 and 803 *c* 23-804 *c* 22; M: pp. 112 *c* 29-113 29; P: I, 32-34; Ms: — ; Mhs: pp. 457 *c* 24-458 *b* 2).

As the inhabitants of Rājagṛha feel annoyed because of the prolonged stay of the Buddha and all his monks, he goes to Dakṣiṇāgiri. But he is accompanied only by few junior monks, because they do not wish to leave their masters. Upon this he lays down that the subordination under a master shall last only five years, unless

[1] In the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin the precepts for teacher and pupil are united with those for master and disciple. In the other versions too there is some jumbling.

the incapacity of the disciple renders a longer duration necessary. At the same time he recounts 5 qualities each, which render the subordination to a master necessary or not necessary (S: p. 151 *a* 8-*b* 3; Dh: pp. 805 *c* 24-806 *b* 1; M: p. 116 *b* 19-*c* 5; P: I, 53; Ms: pp. 1032 *a* 26-*b* 21 and 1031 *c* 11-17; Mhs: p. 460 *b* 5-10 and 17-21). Further he discusses particular cases, in which monks are obliged or not obliged to subordination, and lays down when the subordination is to be considered as extinct (S: — ; Dh: pp. 804 *c* 22-805 *a* 13; M: p. 118 *a* 26-*c* 25; P: I, 73 and 36, 1; Ms: — ; Mhs: p. 460 *b* 10-17).

In the meantime there has been motive for regulating anew the procedure of the monastic ordination. Hitherto the Buddha himself had performed the ordination and later he had also permitted the monks to perform it through causing the applicants to recite the formula of the triple refuge [1]. Now he lays down that the ordination shall take place through a triple interrogation of the community, to be preceded as a fourth item by the proposal (*jñapticaturtham karma*) (S: p. 148 *b* 12-17; Dh: p. 799 *c* 12-29; M: p. 111 *b* 2-23; P: I, 28, 3-6; Ms: — ; Mhs: cf. pp. 412 *b* 26-413 *a* 6). Then he prescribes that the presence of at least ten monks with full rights is necessary for proceeding to the ordination (S: — ; Dh: — ; M: p. 111 *b* 23-25; P: I, 31, 2; Ms: — ; Mhs: cf. p. 416 *b* 7-10). It must not take place without a master for the intended monk; the master must be a monk without blemish and reproach (S: — ; Dh: p. 811 *b* 7-12; M: p. 111 *c* 5-8; P: I, 69; Ms: — ; Mhs — ;). The applicant must possess a monastic robe and an alms-bowl and must not have

1) Cf. Dh: p. 793 *a* 9-21; P: I,12; Ms: p. 1030 *b* 15-*c* 3.

borrowed them (S: — ; Dh: p. 811 *c* 13-20; M: cf. p. 119 *b* 18-22; P: I, 70; Ms: — ; Mhs: —). Lastly the procedure for the contemporaneous ordination of several persons is regulated (S: — ; Dh: p. 805 *b* 1-12; M: p. 112 *a* 10-17; P: I, 74, 2-3; Ms: — ; Mhs: cf. p. 416 *a* 23-*b* 7).

Then the text narrates several incidents which render further regulations necessary. An applicant, whom the monks did not want to admit, is ordained on the command of the Buddha, after a meritorious deed by him has been ascertained (S: — ; Dh: — ; M: p. 112 *b* 11-19; P: I, 28, 1-3; Ms: — ; Mhs: —). It happens that in happy times people seek admittance only for the sake of the easy life. In order to hinder this, the Buddha prescribes that at the ordination the four foundations of monastic life (*niśraya*) should be communicated to the applicant; i.e. that the monk should eat only food given in alms, wear only rags, live under trees and employ as medicine the urine of oxen. This communication should be made after the ordination (S: — ; Dh: p. 811 *b* 12-*c*1; M: p. 112 *b* 19-*c* 16; P: I, 30-31, 1; Ms: — ; Mhs: cf. pp. 413 *c* 12-414 *c* 7). As the admission of heterodox persons leads in many cases to ugly surprises, the Buddha prescribes for these a probation period of four months (S: pp. 150 *b* 26-151 *a* 7; Dh: pp. 806 *c* 10-807 *b* 9; M: p. 115 *a* 1-25; P: I, 38; Ms: pp. 1031 *c* 18-1032 *a* 25; Mhs: pp. 420 *c* 10-421 *a* 20). Several sick people seek admission in the order to let themselves be cured by the famous physician Jīvaka, who, besides the household of king Bimbisāra, attends only the Buddha and his disciples. The Buddha, at the instance of Jīvaka, is compelled to prohibit the admission of the sicks (S: p. 152 *b* 9-*c* 12; Dh: pp. 808 *c* 2-809 *a* 8; M: p. 116 *a* 4-29; P: I, 39; Ms: pp. 1034 *b* 15-1035 *a* 6; Mhs: p. 420 *b* 6-*c* 10).

In the same way he has to forbid the admittance of servants of the king, who try in this manner to avoid their duties (S: — ; Dh: p. 811 *c* 1-13; M: p. 116 *b* 1-18; P: I, 40; Ms: — ; Mhs: pp. 419 *c* 23-420 *a* 18), of slaves (S: p. 151 *c* 13-29; Dh: p. 807 *b* 18-*c* 6; M: — ; P: I, 47; Ms: p. 1033 *a* 12-*b* 21; Mhs: p. 421 *b* 17-*c* 12), of debtors (S: p. 152 *a* 1-17; Dh: p. 807 *c* 15-28; M: p. 115 *a* 26-*b* 10; P: I, 46; Ms: p. 1033 *b* 22-*c* 27; Mhs: p. 420 *a* 18-*b* 6) and of robbers, who in this way seek to evade pursuit (S: — ; Dh: p. 807 *c* 6-15; M: p. 115 *b* 29-*c* 6 and 115 *c* 7-16; P: I, 41 and 42-45; Ms: — ; Mhs: —).

The following case is the occasion for an important rule. The monks, upon their request, admit in the order the young Upāli and his sixteen companions, still mere children, and perform their ordination. The behaviour of these young monks gives offence and induces the Buddha to determine the minimum age for ordination as 20 years. Whoever enters the order earlier, remains a novice (*śramaṇera*) until he reaches this age (S: p. 150 *b* 9-25: Dh: pp. 807 *c* 28-808 *c* 2; M: p. 115 *b* 25-28; P: I, 49; Ms: p. 1032 *b* 22-*c* 6; Mhs: —). At the same time the admission of a father with his little son gives origin to misinterpretations among the laymen, and therefore the Buddha prescribes also for the novices a minimum age of 15 (12) years (S: p. 151 *b* 4-22; Dh: p. 810 *c* 16-23; M: p. 115 *c* 22-116 *a* 3; P: I, 50; Ms: p. 1032 *c* 7-29; Mhs: —). Only in special cases an exception can be made, when the children are at least so grown, that they can scare away the crows (S: p. 151 *b* 23-*c* 1; Dh: pp. 810 *c* 24-811 *a* 3; M: p. 117 *a* 16-28; P: I, 51; Ms: — ; Mhs: cf. p. 460 *c* 11-22). One monk is not allowed to admit two novices at the same time (S: p. 151 *c* 2-12; Dh: p. 811 *a* 3-7; M: p. 115 *c*

17-21; P: I, 52; Ms: p. 1033 *a* 1-5; Mhs: cf. pp. 460 *c* 23-461 *a* 5).

During a visit in Kapilavastu, the former wife of the Buddha sends him his little son Rāhula to claim from him his heritage, whereupon the Buddha charges Śāriputra with admitting Rāhula in the order (S: — ; Dh: p. 809 *c* 3-22; M: p. 116 *c* 6-14; P: I, 54, 1-2; Ms: cf. *Saṃghabhedavastu*, T 1450, p. 159 *a* 8-*b* 10; Mhs: p. 460 *b* 22-25). And since Śāriputra has already a novice, he grants to Śāriputra and to other monks fit for this task the permission of admitting several novices (S: — ; Dh: p. 811 *a* 7-15; M: p. 116 *c* 14-17; P: I, 55; Ms: — ; Mhs: —). At the same time he gives instructions how the admission of a novice should take place (S: pp. 149 *c* 11-150 *b* 8; Dh: p. 810 *b* 11-*c* 1; M: pp. 116 *c* 17-117 *a* 4; P: I, 54, 3 and 56; Ms: — ; Mhs: p. 460 *b* 25-*c* 10). On the representation of his own father Śuddhodana he issues the prohibition to admit a person in the order without the permission of his parents (S: — ; Dh: p. 810 *a* 6-22; M: p. 117 *a* 4-15; P: I, 54, 4-6; Ms: p. 1035 *a* 7-*b* 5; Mhs: p. 421 *a* 20-*b* 17). In some versions there follow several instructions on the treatment of novices.

Next we are told that somebody sneaks into the Order for the purpose of partaking of its advantages (S: p. 153 *a* 26-*b* 17; Dh: pp. 811 *c* 27-812 *a* 11; M: p. 118 *a* 6-16; P: I, 62; Ms: pp. 52,1-53,17; Mhs: pp. 417 *a* 12-*b* 8 and 417 *b* 8-19). Then follows a series of prohibitions concerning the admission to the order; these prohibitions are directed against those who have killed their mother or their father (S: pp. 153 *c* 26-154 *a* 6; Dh: p. 813 *a* 3-28; M: p. 117 *b* 5-12; P: I, 64-65; Ms: pp. 53,18-61,13; Mhs: p. 417 *b* 19-*c* 9), against the murderer of an Arhat

(S. p. 154 *a* 7-26; Dh: p. 813 *a* 28-*b* 7; M: p. 117 *b* 13-22; P: I, 66; Ms: pp. 61,14-64,20; Mhs: cf. p. 417 *c* 9), against the guilty of the rape of a nun (S: pp. 152 *c* 26-153 *a* 25; Dh: — ; M: p. 117 *b* 27-*c* 5; P: I, 67; Ms: — ; Mhs: cf. pp. 416 *c* 2-417 *a* 11), against whoever has wilfully wounded the Buddha or split the community (S: p. 154 *c* 4-11; Dh: p. 813 *b* 7-15; M: p. 117 *b* 23-26; P: I, 67; Ms: pp. 64,21-65,11; Mhs: cf. p. 417 *c* 9), against serpentine or other non-human beings (S: p. 154 *a* 27-*b* 16; Dh: pp. 812 *c* 10-813 *a* 3; M: p. 117 *c* 17-28 and *c* 6-17; P: I, 63; Ms: — [1]; Mhs: —), against renegades (S: p. 153 *c* 18 — 25; Dh: p. 807 *b* 12-18; M: p. 118 *a* 17-20; P: I, 38, 1; Ms: — ; Mhs: —), against eunuchs (S: p. 153 *b* 18-*c* 17; Dh: p. 812 *b* 20-*c* 10; M: pp. 117 *c* 29-118 *a* 5; P: I, 61; Ms: — ; Mhs: pp. 417 *c* 9-418 *a* 9) and against the various sorts of cripples (S: p. 155 *a* 3-*b* 18; Dh: p. 814 *a* 18-*b* 20; M: p. 119 *a* 29-*b* 11; P: I, 71; Ms: p. 66,8-19; Mhs: pp. 418 *b* 14-419 *c* 17, 421 *c* 12-22 and 421 *c* 22-422 *a* 7). Single versions add some more prohibitions.

At the end there is a detailed description of the procedure at the ordination (S: pp. 155 *b* 19-157 *c* 26; Dh: pp. 814 *c* 11-816 *a* 11; M: pp. 119 *b* 22-120 *c* 2; P: I, 76-78; Ms: — ; Mhs: pp. 413 *a* 4-415 *a* 28). There is an additional instruction on the procedure for the readmission of a monk, who had once been expelled because he would not recognize and make amends for an offence against the rules (S: pp. 154 *c* 24-155 *a* 2; Dh: p. 816 *a* 11-23; M: cf. p. 120 *c* 3-12; P: I, 79; Ms: pp. 65,19-66,7; Mhs: —).

[1] In my opinion the whole *Saṃgharakṣitāvadāna* is but an amplification of this section, but the fragmentary condition of the Chinese tradition does not allow us to draw a certain conclusion.

The stories, which give the motive for the several precepts of the Buddha, are rather lengthy, as is usually the case at the beginning of Indian works. But none of them deserves the name of real legends; at the most, perhaps the tale of how the Buddha admits his son Rāhula into the Order.

2. – Poṣadhavastu.

(S: 2. *Pu–sa fa*, pp. 158 *a* 1-165 *a* 4; Dh: 2. *Sho chieh chien-tu*, pp. 816 *c* 5-830 *a* 24; M: 2. *Pu–sa fa*, pp. 121 *b* 1-129 *a* 1; P: 2. *Uposathakkhandhaka*, *Mahāvagga*, II; Ms: 2. *Poṣadhavastu*, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. III, part 4, pp. 69-116; Mhs: *Tsa sung pa ch'ü fa*, pp. 446 *c* 7-450 *c* 2 and 480 *a* 15-*b* 1; cf. p. 499 *a* 22-*c* 27).

The 2nd chapter contains the account of the introduction of the monthly confession ceremonies and the rules connected herewith.

At the suggestion of king Bimbisāra or of other laymen the Buddha, on the example of other sects, prescribes that the community shall assemble on the eighth and fourteenth or fifteenth day of every fortnight (S: p. 158 *a* 4-15; Dh: pp. 816 *c* 6-817 *a* 3; M: p. 121 *b* 5-16; P: II, 1; Ms: pp. 71,6-72,15; Mhs: p. 446 *c* 12-20); on this occasion the Doctrine shall be recited (S: — ; Dh: p. 817 *a* 3-9; M: p. 121 *b* 17-20; P: II, 2; Mhs: —).

Later he comes upon the idea, to cause the confession formula (*prātimokṣa*) to be recited at these assemblies. He accordingly issues the order (S: p. 158 *a* 4-15; Dh: p. 817 *b* 22-*c* 4; M: p. 121 *b* 5-16; P: II, 3, 1-2; Ms: pp. 80,20-81,3: Mhs: —) and at the same time explains

how the recitation of the formula should commence (S: — ; Dh: p. 817 *c* 4-25; M: p. 122 *a* 6-18; P: II, 3, 3-8; Mhs: —). He lays down that the confession ceremonies should be held only on the fourteenth or fifteenth day of every fortnight (S: p. 158 *b* 2-5; Dh: p. 817 *c* 26 seq.; M: p. 121 *b* 17-20; P: II, 4 and 14, 1; Mhs: cf. p. 447 *a* 14-23), gives instructions on the manner in which the formula must be recited (S: — Dh: p. 817 *c* 25 seq.; cf. p. 822 *b* 24-*c* 2; M: p. 128 *b* 22 seq. and 27-29; P: II, 16, 6-7; Mhs: —), prescribes that the monks should be acquainted with the calendar (S: — ; Dh: pp. 817 *c* 27-818 *a* 15; M: p. 123 *b* 3-7: P: II, 18, 1-2; Ms: — ; Mhs: —), lays down how the confession ceremonies should be announced, how the monks should be called together (S: — ; Dh: p. 818 *a* 15-21; M: pp. 122 *c* 14-123 *a* 3 and 128 *c* 23-25; P. II, 19; Mhs: —) and how the number of the attending monks should be ascertained (S: — ; Dh: p. 819 *a* 18-29; M: p. 123 *a* 3-17; P: II, 18, 3-4; Mhs: —).

In order to underscore the importance of the confession ceremony, there follows the story of the monk Mahākappina (Aniruddha), who stays aside from the confession ceremony because he has no sin to confess, and whom the Buddha in person summons to come to the ceremony (S: p. 158 *a* 16-*b* 2; Dh: p. 818 *a* 28-*b* 16; M: pp. 121 *c* 27-122 *a* 6; P: II, 5, 3-6; Ms: pp. 82,14-83,22; Mhs: p. 447 *c* 21-448 *a* 1).

What follows is a long series of sundry rules; firstly regulations on the room in which the confession ceremony is to be held and on its upkeep (S: — ; Dh: pp. 818 *b* 22-819 *a* 10; M: pp. 121 *c* 8-11 and 122 *b* 20-*c* 13; P: II, 8-9 and 20; Ms: pp. 81,3-82,9; Mhs: cf. p. 447 *a* 24-*b* 4). The duty of taking part in a common ceremony of confession requires a determination as to which monks belong

together and must participate in the same ceremony. The Buddha, therefore prescribes that a community procedure should settle the limits of a common dwelling zone, inside which all the monks must come to the same confession ceremony. He gives rules for the abolition and modification of these limits (S: pp. 158 *b* 2-*c* 10 and 159 *a* 8-22; Dh: pp. 819 *a* 29-821 *a* 20; M: pp. 123 *c* 12-124 *b* 16; P: II, 6-7 and 12-13; Ms: pp. 84,1-94,4; Mhs: —). He distinguishes four sorts of confession ceremony, according whether the assembly is complete or not complete and acts according to the rules or against them (S: p. 159 *a* 23-29; Dh: p. 821 *b* 22-*c* 5; M: p. 122 *b* 7-11; P: II, 14, 2-3; Ms: p. 94,5-8; Mhs: —). In the same manner he distinguishes 4 or 5 manners to recite the confession formula, according whether the recitation is more or less complete (S: p. 159 *a* 29-*b* 10; Dh: p. 823 *a* 29-*b* 15; M: p. 122 *a* 19-26 and 127 *b* 1-8; P: II, 15, 1-4; Ms: p. 94,9-20; Mhs: p. 450 *b* 22-26). Other rules concern the possibility that the monks do not know the confession formula and the various sorts of community procedure (S: p. 159 *b* 11-16 and *b* 25-*c* 2; Dh: p. 825 *a* 11-*b* 14; M: p. 124 *b* 27-*c* 3; 128 *b* 11-18 and *c* 1-9; P: II, 17 and 21, 3-4; Ms: pp. 95,4-97,10; Mhs: p. 448 *a* 9-*b* 2); it is added that such monks shall particularly honour a monk who is well versed in the rules (S: p. 159 *c* 2-12; Dh: p. 825 *c* 15-23; M: p. 125 *a* 3-6; cf. 125 *b* 10-*c* 6; P: II, 21, 2; Ms: cf. pp. 97,11-98,8; Mhs: —). Then follow prescriptions on the modalities of the ceremony when only one or few monks are present at the place (S: pp. 159 *c* 12-160 *a* 16; Dh: p. 821 *b* 8-22; M: p. 123 *b* 17-24; P: II, 26; Ms: p. 101,15 seq.; Mhs: p. 450 *b* 8-22 and 448 *c* 7-13). Numerous rules concern the possibility that some

monk be hindered to participate in the ceremony or in a community procedure (S: p. 160 *c* 8-13 and 161 *a* 23-28; Dh: pp. 822 *c* 28-823 *a* 29; M: p. 126 *b* 8-15; P: II, 24; Mhs: —) [1]. Such a monk must deliver a declaration of purity for the confession ceremony, and a declaration of agreement for the community procedure (S: pp. 160 *a* 17-*c* 7 and 160 *c* 14-161 *a* 22; cf. 164 *c* 20-165 *a* 3; Dh: pp. 821 *c* 5-822 *b* 24; M: p. 126 *a* 5-*b* 7; cf. 127 *a* 26-29; P: II, 22-23; cf. 36,4; Ms: pp. 98,15-101,14; Mhs: p. 449 *a* 14-*b* 9, *b* 20-*c* 5, *c* 10-17; 449 *c* 29-450 *a* 9, *a* 22-*b* 8). There are special rules for monks stricken by mental diseases (S: p. 161 *a* 29-*b* 14; Dh: pp. 823 *b* 16-824 *a* 7; M: pp. 125 *c* 7-126 *a* 5; P. II, 25; Mhs: p. 480 *a* 15-*b* 1). If a monk is guilty of an offence against the rules, he must make amends before the ceremony (S: p. 161 *b* 15-*c* 28; Dh: pp. 825 *c* 23-827 *b* 6; M: pp. 124 *c* 3-125 *a* 2 and 125 *a* 7-22; P: II, 27; Mhs: —). Detailed prescriptions are provided for the various possibilities arising when other monks arrive in the course of the ceremony (S: pp. 161 *c* 29-163 *c* 16; Dh: pp. 827 *b* 6-829 *b* 7; M: pp. 127 *b* 9-128 *b* 5; P: II, 28-34; Ms: pp. 103,1-114,16; Mhs: pp. 448 *b* 9-21 and 448 *c* 2-449 *a* 14; cf. 449 *c* 17-29). Also the case of a change of place on the day of the ceremony is foreseen (S: pp. 163 *c* 17-164 *c* 13; Dh: p. 829 *b* 8-*c* 2; M: p. 128 *b* 6-10; P: II, 35; Ms: pp. 114,19-116,11; Mhs: —). Lastly there are provisions against interruptions of the ceremony caused by the presence of laymen or other unauthorized persons, by the arrival of the king or by an attack by robbers etc. (S: p. 164 *c* 14-20; Dh: pp. 829 *c*

[1] For the monk who is unable to attend the community proceedings, the prescriptions are quite similar to those for the monk who cannot come to the confession ceremony. They are, therefore, treated together.

20-830 *a* 4; M: p. 127 *a* 12-26; cf. 126 *b* 16-22; P: II, 36, 1-3; Mhs: pp. 447 *c* 3-21 and 448 *b* 21-*c* 2; cf. 449 *b* 9-20).

In contrast with the first chapter, the occasions for the prescriptions issued by the Buddha are related in some detail only in a very few cases. The only story that resembles somewhat a legend is that of Mahākappina's absence from the confession ceremony.

3. – Varṣāvastu.

(S: 4. *An chü fa*, pp. 173 *b* 1-178 *a* 13; Dh: 3. *An chü chien-tu*, pp. 830 *b* 1-835 *c* 11; M: 3. *An chü fa*, pp. 129 *a* 2-130 *c* 18; P: *Vassupanāyikakkhandhaka*, *Mahāvagga*, III; Ms: 4. *Varṣāvastu* (*An chü shih*), T 1445, pp. 1041 *a* 22-1044 *c* 6; *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. III, part 4, pp. 131-155; Mhs: *Tsa sung po ch'ü fa*, pp. 450 *c* 2-451 *a* 6).

The 3rd chapter gives the rules for the residence of the monks during the rainy season.

The laymen are scandalized because the Buddhist monks, in contrast with those of other sects, roam about even during the rainy season, and thus jeopardize animal life. Upon this the Buddha orders that the monks pass the rainy season at one and the same place (S: p. 173 *b* 4-15; Dh: pp. 830 *b* 5-*c* 7; M: p. 129 *a* 6-15; P: III, 1 and 3; Ms: p. 1041 *a* 26-*b* 9; Mhs: p. 450 *c* 3-8). This retirement of the rainy season lasts for three months and can be entered earlier or later (S: — ; Dh: p. 832 *a* 20-*b* 9; M: p. 129 *b* 21-23; P: III, 2; Ms; cf. p. 1042 *b* 3 seq.; Mhs: —), and the entrance takes place through pronouncing a declaration in the presence of the other monks (S: p. 173 *b* 18-*c* 10; Dh: p. 830 *c* 7-11; M: p. 129 *a* 15-19; P: — ; Ms:

pp. 135,14-136,4; Mhs: p. 450 *c* 8-17). Several prescriptions regulate the choice of the place for the retirement and decide which places are allowed and which are prohibited (S: — ; Dh: p. 832 *b* 9-833 *a* 2; M: p. 129 *a* 22-*b* 19; P: III, 12; Ms: — ; Mhs —); they lay down which preparations are to be made, how the rooms and the furniture are to be distributed, and what is to be done if afterwards more monks arrive (S: — ; Dh: p. 831 *a* 1-*b* 17; M: p. 129 *a* 22 and B 23-27; P: — ; Ms: p. 1041 *b* 9-1042 *a* 14; further pp. 133,1-135,13; Mhs: —).

Very precise regulations deal with the cases in which abandonment of the fixed residence becomes necessary. The motive for it is given by the lay devotee Udayana, who on the occasion of a giftdistribution invites the monks during the rainy season. As the monks do not dare to accept the invitation, the Buddha grants permission to abandon in such case the residence even during the rainy season, upto a maximum duration of 7 days (S: pp. 173 *c* 11-174 *a* 7; Dh: p. 833 *a* 2-8; M: p. 129 *b* 28-*c* 6; P: III, 5, 1-4; Ms: pp. 136,15-138,3; Mhs: pp. 450 *c* 18-451 *a* 6). At the same time he determines exactly, for what sort of persons and for which motives this may happen (S: pp. 174 *a* 8-176 *c* 15; Dh: p. 833 *a* 8-*c* 14; M: cf. p. 129 *c* 6-11; P: III, 5, 4-7; Ms: pp. 138,4-143,7; Mhs: —). In this connection he explains in which occasions it is permitted to leave permanently the residence of the rainy season (S: pp. 176 *c* 15-177 *c* 11; Dh: pp. 834 *a* 10-835 *a* 6; M: pp. 129 *b* 20 seq. and 130 *a* 2-*b* 5; P: III, 9-11; Ms: pp. 143,11-147,3 and 153,1-154,7; Mhs: —). Lastly the case is provided for, that a monk has promised a layman to pass the rainy season at a given place, but nevertheless quits this place. It is explained in which

cases such a monk commits an offence or does not (S: pp. 177 *c* 12-178 *a* 12; Dh: p. 835 *a* 14-*c* 11; M: p. 130 *b* 5-*c* 9; P: III, 14; Ms: pp. 147,4-152,18; Mhs: —).

In this chapter too real legends are lacking.

4. – Pravāraṇāvastu.

(S: 3. *Tzŭ tzŭ fa*, pp. 165 *a* 5-173 *a* 28; Dh: 4. *Tzŭ tzŭ chien-tu*, pp. 835 *c* 12-843 *b* 10; M: 4. *Tzŭ tzŭ fa*, pp. 130 *c* 19-133 *c* 20; P: 4. *Pavāraṇakkhandhaka*, *Mahāvagga*, IV; Ms: 3. *Pravāraṇāvastu* (*Sui i shih*), T 1446, pp. 1044 *c* 7-1048 *b* 23; Gilgit Manuscripts, Vol. III, Part 4, pp. 117-130; Mhs: *Tsa sung po ch'ü fa*, pp. 451 *a* 6-452 *a* 1).

The 4th chapter concerns the Pravāraṇā ceremony, which concludes the retirement of the rainy season. The precepts here contained are often similar to those in the chapter on the confession ceremony, and in some versions the latter is expressly quoted.

The following incident gives the motive for the introduction of the Pravāraṇā ceremony. Some monks, who pass the rainy season together have agreed, in order to avoid disputes, not to speak with each other [1]. When the Buddha hears of this, he sharply rebukes them, and establishes, in order to prevent discord within the community, the Pravāraṇā ceremony, in which every monk invites the others to tell him whether they have anything to reproach him, and declares himself ready, if he recognizes his mistake, to make amends for it (S: p. 165 *a* 8-*b*

[1] The purpose of this narrative was no longer understood in Dh and M. These two versions give therefore another reason for the establishment of the Pravāraṇā ceremony. Also Mhs has a noteworthy double.

14; Dh: pp. 835 *c* 13-836 *a* 17 and 836 *b* 9-14; M: pp. 130 *c* 20-131 *a* 6 and 131 *a* 29-*b* 5; P: IV, 1, 1-13; Ms: pp. 1044 *c* 11-1045 *a* 6; Mhs: p. 451 *a* 7-25; cf. 451 *a* 26-*b* 6). At the same time he gives precise rules for carrying out the ceremony. It must take place at the end of the rainy season; the moment is exactly defined, and there is even some provision for the case that a section of the monks has entered the retirement of the rainy season earlier and a section later (S: — ; Dh: p. 837 *a* 25-*b* 8; M: p. 131 *b* 8-11; P: IV, 3, 1; Ms: p. 1045 *a* 10; Mhs: p. 451 *b* 9-15). The ceremony is to be witnessed in a squatting position. Only he who has already addressed his invitation to the other monks may sit down; but he is not allowed to depart (S: — ; Dh: p. 836 c 3-10; M: p. 131 *b* 14-24; P: IV, 2; Ms: — ; Mhs: —). The invitation is as a rule to be addressed individually, according to a settled rule of precedence based on the age of the monks [1] (S: — ; Dh p. 836 *b* 14-19; M: p. 131 *b* 24-*c* 1; P: — ; Ms: — ; Mhs: p. 451 *b* 19-22).

Concerning the performance of the ceremony, first one or more directors of the same are elected; a list is given of five qualities each, which he must or must not possess (S: p. 165 *b* 14-29; Dh: p. 836 *b* 19-*c* 3; M: p. 131 *c* 1-12; P: — ; Ms: p. 1045 *a* 16-*b* 6; Mhs: p. 451 *b* 22-27). The ceremony itself begins with a solemn announcement. Then every monk in turn addresses thrice his invitation to the others (S: p. 165 *b* 29-*c* 25; Dh: p. 837 *a* 3-7; cf. p. 837 *a* 10-18; M: p. 131 *b* 5-7; P: IV, 1, 14; Ms: p. 1045 *b* 12-26; Mhs: p 451 *b* 27-*c* 8).

[1] With age the Vinaya means always the monastic seniority, i.e. the span of time after ordination.

Four kinds of Pravāraṇā ceremony are distinguished, according whether the ceremony is carried out according to the rules or against them and the community is complete or incomplete (S: pp. 165 *c* 25-166 *a* 1; Dh: p. 837 *a* 18-25; M: — ; P: IV, 3, 2; Ms: p. 1045 *c* 13-16; Mhs: —). Particular stress is laid on completeness. Accordingly, there are detailed instructions for the case that a monk is hindered by illness to participate in the ceremony. If he is absolutely in no condition to move, then in case of necessity the community must betake itself to him. But in no case the ceremony may be held before an incomplete assembly. In most cases, however, it is sufficient that the sick monk sends to the assembly a declaration; detailed rules regulate the form of this declaration, the manner of transmission, and when it must be reckoned as valid or not [1]. (S: p. 166 *b* 1-*c* 15; Dh: p. 838 *a* 7-*c* 2; M: p. 131 *c* 19-22: P: IV, 3, 3-5; Ms: pp. 1045 *c* 16-1046 *a* 16 and 1048 *b* 5-9, further p. 130,11-18; Mhs: p. 451 *c* 8-14). Further rules refer to the possibility that a monk be hindered by open force to participate in the Pravāraṇā ceremony (S: p. 166 *c* 15-21; Dh: — ; M: — ; P: IV, 4; Ms: p. 124,6-14; Mhs: —).

Particular rules concern the Pravāraṇā ceremony of a smaller number of monks (S: p. 166 *a* 1-29; Dh: pp. 837 *c* 17-838 *a* 7; M: — ; P: IV, 5; Ms: p. 1046 *a* 17-*b* 8; Mhs: pp. 451 *c* 19-452 *a* 1). In case of danger an abbreviated form of ceremony is allowed (S: pp. 171 *a* 4 seq. and 171 *a*

1) It is remarkable that the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika prohibits the delivering of such a declaration; in my opinion it is possibly a later addition on the model of the declaration of purity at the confession ceremony. At the Pravāraṇā ceremony, where a question must be addressed to the assembly, the delivery of a declaration is indeed meaningless.

14-172 *b* 25; Dh: pp. 838 *c* 16-839 *a* 15; M: — ; P: IV, 15; Ms: pp. 1046 *b* 16-1047 *a* 19, further pp. 119,1-123,5; Mhs: —). Then the text discusses in detail what should be done if other monks arrive during the Pravāraṇā ceremony (S: pp. 167 *b* 3-168 *c* 24; Dh: pp. 841 *a* 11-842 *c* 16; M: — ; P: IV, 7-13; Ms: pp. 128,21-129,8; Mhs: —). The performance of the ceremony in the presence of unauthorized persons is forbidden (S: p. 173 *a* 10-14; Dh: cf. p. 843 *a* 27-*b* 4; M: p. 131 *b* 11-14; P: IV, 14; Ms: — ; Mhs: —).

A whole set of rules refers to what should be done if a monk makes himself guilty of an offence immediately before the Pravāraṇā ceremony. The general rule is that he must make amends before the ceremony and that also the punishment by the community must take place before it (S: pp. 166 *c*-167 *b* 2; 168 *c* 25-169 *b* 12 and 173 *a* 14-24; Dh: p. 839 *a* 15-22; M: — ; P: IV, 6; Ms: pp. 124,15-125,9; Mhs: —). Special rules concern the case that opinion on the seriousness of the offence may differ (S: — ; Dh: p. 839 *a* 22-*b* 3; M: p. 132 *c* 13-133 *a* 2; P: IV, 16, 19-22; Ms: — ; Mhs: —). But in no case a monk may participate in the Pravāraṇā ceremony without having made amends. If he tries to do so, objection should be made (S: — ; Dh: — ; M: p. 131 *c* 23-27; P: IV, 16, 1-3; Ms: — ; Mhs: —); several cases of valid or invalid objection are distinguished (S: pp. 170 *c* 26-171 *a* 14; Dh: p. 839 *b* 24-*c* 6; M: pp. 131 *c* 28-132 *a* 25; P: IV, 16, 4-5; Ms: — ; Mhs: —). If an objection is made, first of all the monk, who makes it, should be considered. If he himself is not blameless, his objection is to be rejected. In the other case, his reasons must be examined, and if they are found valid, action should be taken accordingly (S: pp. 169 *b*

13-170 *b* 14; Dh: pp. 839 *c* 6-840 *a* 19; M: p. 133 *a* 23-*b* 18; P: IV, 16, 6-18; Ms: pp. 125,10-128,18; Mhs: —). A separate treatment is given to the question what should be done if the doer only, or the deed only, or both are known or unknown (S: p. 172 *c* 6-15; Dh: p. 840 *c* 9-18; M: p. 133 *a* 3-7; P: IV, 16, 23-25; Ms: p. 1048 *b* 9-22; Mhs; —). If the monk who makes the objection, or the one against whom it is directed, is ill, the question should be adjourned on account of the illness (S: p. 170 *c* 15-26; Dh: p. 840 *a* 19-*b* 3; M: p. 133 *a* 8-15; P: IV, 17, 7-10; Ms: — ; Mhs: –).

Lastly there are some special cases. In one of them, monks that have passed the rainy season under particularly favourable conditions, would like to postpone the Pravāraṇā ceremony. This is allowed, and special regulations are made for the monks who on account of serious reasons cannot wait (S: pp. 172 *c* 15-173 *a* 3; Dh: p. 840 *b* 3-13; M: p. 133 *b* 19-*c* 1; P: IV, 18; Ms: — ; Mhs: —). In another case it is laid down how should monks behave, when strange monks intend to disturb their Pravāraṇā ceremony (S: p. 170 *b* 15-*c* 14; Dh: p. 840 *b* 13-*c* 8; M: p. 133 *c* 2-19; P: IV, 17, 1-6; Ms: pp. 129,12-130,10; Mhs: —).

In this chapter legends and legend-like stories are completely lacking.

5. – Carmavastu.

(S: 5. *P'i ko fa*, pp. 178 *a* 14-184 *b* 17; Dh: 5. *P'i ko chien-tu*, pp. 843 *b* 11-849 *b* 9; M: 6. *P'i ko fa*, pp. 144 *a* 12-147 *a* 25; P: 5. *Cammakkhandhaka*, *Mahāvagga*, V; Ms:

5. *Carmavastu* (*P'i ko shih*). T 1447, pp. 1048 *c* 1-1057 *b* 19 and T 1450, pp. 184 *b* 26-187 *c* 20; Gilgit Manuscripts, Vol. III, Part 4, pp. 157-210; Mhs: *Tsa sung po ch'ü fa*, pp. 480 *c* 20-482 *b* 13; 415 *c* 17-416 *a* 21; 484 *c* 22-485 *a* 10 and 487 *a* 29-*b* 23).

The following four chapters deal with the daily needs of the monks, with food and clothing. The nature of the subject implies that the general and obvious is rather disregarded in favour of rules for special cases. This is above all clear in the chapter on food. It deals also with the drugs which are permitted to the monks; and since in the rules on food too there is a strong bias upon due regard for the sick, the whole chapter has received therefrom its name.

First comes the chapter on the use of shoes and leather in general. It contains two legends told at great length. One is the tale of the monk Śroṇa Koṭīviṃśa, which hails from a very rich family and is so spoilt at home, that the soles of his feet are very soft and bear fine hair. When he wanders up and down in deep meditation, his feet are hurt and his path is smeared with blood. The Buddha thereupon allows him the use of simple shoes, and since Śroṇa Koṭīviṃśa does not want to accept any special permission, he extends the permission to all the monks. The narrative is elaborated and further embellished in most versions (S: p. 183 *a* 15-*b* 3; Dh: pp. 843 *b* 12-845 *a* 25; M: pp. 145 *a* 13-146 *b* 15; P: V, 1; Ms: T 1447, pp. 1055 *c* 14-1056 *a* 15 and T 1450, pp. 184 *b* 26-187 *c* 20; further pp. 202,10-204,4; Mhs: pp. 481 *a* 2-482 *a* 1).

Then follows a long series of regulations on the shape and material of the allowed footgear, and when it may

be worn [1]. Ornate shoes and shoes of fine leather are forbidden. Clattering wooden sandals may be used only for special purposes. In the presence of the Buddha or of a teacher no shoes are allowed, if the former are barefoot. Sick monks are allowed special facilities; it is the ever sickly monk Pilindavatsa who gives the occasion for these regulations. Some cases are even narrated in detail, such as for instance the story of the monk Upananda, who would like to possess the variegated fell of a calf and therefore instigates the owner to kill it (S: p. 182 *b* 4-24; Dh: p. 846 *c* 6-19; M: p. 144 *c* 8-20; P: V, 10, 7-10; Ms: pp. 196,6-197,14; Mhs: p. 487 *a* 29-*b* 23). In the same context also other subjects are treated, such as the employment of leather for benches and sleeping couches; it is prohibited to employ high and broad couches. There are also regulations on the permission for monks to use vehicles and riding beasts.

The other large legendary story of this chapter refers to Śroṇa Koṭikarṇa [2]. This is a pupil of Mahākātyāyana and his home is in Avanti (Áśmāparāntaka). As there are still very few monks there at this time, several years elapse before he can be ordained, because it is not possible to collect earlier the number of ten monks that is necessary for ordination. When he afterwards travels to Śrāvastī to see the Buddha, his teacher entrusts him with the task of begging the Buddha in his name to grant some relaxations, as are rendered desirable by local usage

1) For these countless unimportant regulations, which assume different forms in the various versions, I have deemed it useless to give exact quotations.

2) Treated in detail by S. LÉVI, *Sur la récitation primitive des textes bouddhiques*, in *J. As.*, 1915, I, pp. 401-447. Cf. E. WALDSCHMIDT, *Zur Sroṇakoṭikarṇa-Legende*, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1952, Nr. 6.

and by the special conditions in Avanti. The Buddha grants these relaxations, not only for Avanti, but for all the countries at the margin of the Buddhist regions, in so far as the same conditions apply for them. Since the use of shoes and leather is also affected thereby, in the greater part of the versions the whole story is included in this chapter. With the Mahāsāṃghika it stands in the section on monastic ordination, since one of the relaxations prescribes that in the said countries the presence of five monks is sufficient for carrying out the ordination (S: pp. 178 *a* 17-182 *a* 21; Dh: pp. 845 *b* 5-846 *a* 14; M: p. 144 *a* 13-*c* 4; P: V, 13; Ms: pp. 1048 *c* 5-1053 *c* 5; further pp. 159,4-193,20; Mhs: pp. 415 *b* 17-416 *a* 21).

6. - Bhaiṣajyavastu [1].

(S: 6. *Yao fa*, pp. 184 *b* 18-194 *b* 3; Dh: 7. *Yao chien-tu*, pp. 866 *c* 1-877 *c* 4; M: 7. *Yao fa*, p. 147 *b* 1-147 *c* 28 and 8. *Shih fa*, pp. 147 *c* 29-153 *a* 17; P: 6. *Bhesajjakkhandhaka*, *Mahāvagga*, VI; Ms: 6. *Bhaiṣajyavastu* (*Yao shih*), T 1448, pp. 1 *a* 1-97 *a* 24; *Gilgit Manuscripts*, (quoted here as G) vol. III, part 1; Mhs: *Tsa sung po ch'ü fa*, pp. 457 *b* 3-23; 462 *c* 5-464 *c* 2; 470 *c* 21-471 *a* 24; 477 *a* 5-478 *a* 19; 485 *c* 21-487 *a* 28 and 488 *b* 12-*c* 6).

The 6th chapter deals with the rules on the food of the monks and on the drugs permitted to them. Both items are mingled together in most versions, only the

1) Cf. J. Jaworski, *La section des Remèdes dans le Vinaya des Mahīśāsaka et dans le Vinaya pāli*, in *Rocznik Orjentalistyczny*, V, 1927, pp. 92-101; Id., *La section de la Nourriture dans le Vinaya des Mahīśāsaka*, ibid. VII, 1931, pp. 53-124.

Vinaya of the Mahīśāsaka tries to keep them separate. This chapter contains, beside the dry account of how the Buddha issues the various regulations, a large number of stories, elaborated in the shape of legends.

The narrative begins with the Buddha granting to the monks, who in autumn suffer from several kinds of sickness, at first four (five) medicinal drugs: clarified butter, oil, honey, molasses (and fresh butter) (S: p. 184 *b* 21-*c* 5; Dh: p. 869 *b* 21-*c* 3; M: p. 147 *b* 5-8; P: VI, 1, 1-3; Ms: cf. p. 1 *a* 8-14; G. I, 8-11, 5; Mhs: —). To this he adds the permission, to partake of these remedies even outside the usual times for food (S: p. 184 *c* 5-11; Dh: p. 869 *c* 3-9; M: — ; P: VI, 1, 4-5; Ms: — ; Mhs: —). Later he distinguishes four kinds of drugs, according as they may be used once, for a short time, for a week or for the whole life (S: pp. 193 *c* 19-194 *a* 16; Dh: — ; M: — ; P: — ; Ms: p. 1 *a* 14-*b* 29; G. II, 6-IV, 6; Mhs: cf. p. 457 *b* 3-23); it is also foreseen that several such remedies may be taken together (S: p. 194 *a* 16-26; Dh: p. 870 *b* 26-*c* 3; M: p. 147 *c* 21-27; P: VI, 40, 2-3; Ms: p. 1 *b* 29-*c* 11; G. IV, 7-V, 3; Mhs: —).

Then follows a long series of stories, which tell us in a few dry words how some monk suffers of this or that illness and how the Buddha permits from case to case the necessary remedies [1] (S: pp. 184 *c* 12-185 *a* 15; 185 *b* 22-*c* 5; Dh: pp. 866 *c* 23-867 *b* 29; 869 *c* 14-18; 870 *c* 4-871 *a* 20; 874 *a* 25-*b* 23 and 876 *c* 28-877 *b* 10; M: p. 147 *b* 26-*c* 15; P: VI, 2-14; 16, 3; Ms: p. 1 *c* 12-2 *c* 27; G. V, 4-X, 11; Mhs: p. 464 *b* 14-*c* 2). Several outstanding cases occur

[1] These minor rules appear disjointed and show strong variants in most versions.

in all or most versions; thus the story of a mad monk, who is healed by eating raw meat and blood (S: p. 185 *a* 7-15; Dh: p. 868 *b* 5-9; M: — ; P: VI, 10, 2; Ms: p. 2 *c* 7-27; G. IX, 10 — X, 11; Mhs: cf. p. 486 *c* 1-16). Some rules of a special sort are added. Thus the Buddha prohibits, because too dangerous, surgical operations on the anus (S: p. 187 *a* 28-*b* 5; Dh: p. 871 *a* 13-18; M: p. 147 *c* 10-13; P: VI, 22, 1-3; Ms: cf. pp. 5 *c* 9-7 *a* 7; Mhs: p. 488 *b* 12-25). The monk Pilindavatsa, being permanently ill, accumulates a great quantity of drugs, and the inconveniences that arise therefrom induce the Buddha to forbid to keep drugs for more than 7 days (S: p. 185 *a* 16-*b* 10; Dh: p. 870 *b* 3-23; M: — ; P: VI, 15, 9-10; Ms: — ; Mhs: —). Another time the monk Revata, who has already earned the name of Doubting Revata (Kāṃkṣā–Revata) because of his continuous doubts, sees how in a sugar factory flour is mixed with molasses, and since then he avoids to partake of molasses out of the regular feeding time; but the Buddha dispels his doubts (S: p. 185 *b* 11-21; Dh: p. 870 *a* 23-25; M: p. 147 *c* 15-21; P: VI, 16, 1; Ms: p. 3 *a* 13-*b* 1 and 3 *b* 1-9; G. XI, 6-XII, 3 and XII, 4-19; Mhs: —).

The following story introduces the rules on food in general. The pious lay devotee Mahāsenā (Suppiyā), who exerts herself to procure for the monks everything necessary, hears from a sick monk that he urgently needs meat for his recovery; as it is impossible for her to procure meat, she cuts a piece of flesh from her own thigh. The Buddha, upon discovering this, heals her by his miraculous powers. Then he rebukes the sick monk and prescribes, in order to avoid the repetition of such an event in the future, that in accepting meat one should always inquire about its origin (S: p. 185 *c* 5-186 *b* 1; Dh: pp. 868 *c*

5-869 *a* 18; M: p. 148 *b* 10-*c* 11; P: VI, 23, 1-9; Ms: p. 3 *b* 26-4 *b* 1; G. XIV, 9 seqq.; Mhs: p. 486 *a* 24-*c* 1). In this connection he forbids also the use of the flesh of elephants, horses, dogs, and snakes (etc.) (S: pp. 186 *b* 2-187 *a* 3; Dh: p. 868 *b* 9-*c* 5; M: pp. 148 *c* 11-149 *a* 3; P: VI, 23, 10-15; Ms: p. 5 *a* 2-*b* 12; Mhs: pp. 486 *c* 16-487 *a* 28).

Regulations on food in general are found only occasionally in the extant versions. They limit themselves to declaring as licit alms of food of the most different sorts (S: p. 193 *c* 15-19; Dh: p. 866 *c* 5-20; M: pp. 147 *c* 24-148 *a* 11; P: cf. VI, 40, 1; Ms: — ; Mhs: —). Also rules on the acceptance of invitations from laymen are scarce. Occasionally it is mentioned which invitations may be accepted, to whom they extend and how regular invitations should be dealt with (S: — ; Dh: p. 869 *a* 18-*b* 5; M: p. 149 *a* 3-24; 152 *a* 25-*b* 6; P: — ; Ms: — ; Mhs: —). It is repeatedly enjoined that one should not, upon receiving an invitation, eat beforehand elsewhere (S: cf. p. 190 *b* 25-*c* 8 [1]; Dh: — ; M: p. 149 *a* 25-*b* 6; P: VI, 25; Ms: — ; Mhs: pp. 470 *c* 21-471 *a* 24).

For the rest the rules on the food of the monks are severe. They must live of the food they get in alms. They are forbidden to cook it themselves (S: p. 187 *a* 4-14; Dh: p. 871 *a* 20-24; M: p. 148 *a* 28-*b* 9; P: VI, 17, 1-5; Ms: p. 7 *a* 8-26; Mhs: p. 477 *c* 20-29). Only the heating of food already cooked is allowed (S: p. 187 *a* 15-27; Dh: — ; M: — ; P: VI, 17, 6; Ms: p. 7 *a* 27-*b* 27; Mhs: p. 477 *c* 27). In case of need, in order to preserve foodstuffs from decay, a room can be employed as storeroom (*kalpikaśālā*), and precise instructions are given

1) Given in S as a rule for times of need.

for its use (S: p. 190 *a* 6-*b* 1; Dh: pp. 871 *b* 5-7 and 874 *c* 5-875 *a* 14; M: pp. 149 *c* 26-150 *b* 25; P: VI, 33; Ms: cf. G. 234, 17-236, 8; Mhs: p. 477 *a* 19-*c* 20).

A relaxation of the severe regulations on food is foreseen for times of need. Then it is allowed to preserve foodstuffs in the monastery and to cook them personally. In case of invitations, it is permissible to take along for later consumption food that has been left over or given afterwards. Remains of meals of other monks, chiefly of the sick, may be eaten. Edible fruits of the forest and water plants may be gathered, even if they are not given in alms [1], etc. But with the end of the emergency all these relaxations lapse (S: pp. 190 *c* 8-191 *a* 25; Dh: p. 876 *a* 10-*b* 24; cf. pp. 867 *c* 29-868 *b* 5; M: p. 148 *a* 12-*b* 9; 152 *b* 11-*c* 17; P: VI, 17, 7; 18-21; 32; Ms: G. 233, 8-234, 6; 237, 17-239,17; Mhs: —). In this case too some incidents are narrated in detail. Thus Maudgalyāyana by his miraculous powers brings to his friend Śāriputra, who is ill, a great quantity of lotus stalks, and the latter distributes what is left to the other monks, to whom the Buddha permits its consumption [2] (S: pp. 190 *c* 24-191 *a* 8; Dh: p. 867 *b* 29-*c* 29; M: — ; P: VI, 20; Ms: G. 239, 18 seqq.; Mhs: —).

These regulations of a general kind are followed by a number of legends, narrated more or less in detail, at the end of which there are always some instructions given by the Buddha in the said circumstances. They are the following [3].

1) Partly given as a general permission, valid even without an emergency.

2) This tale too is partly referred to a generally valid permission.

3) I think that also the legend of Agnidatta (Verañjo), which in some versions stands at the beginning of the *Vibhaṅgo*, belonged originally to the

The legend of Vajraṭṭasiṃha (Belaṭṭho Kaccāno), who treats the monks to an enormous quantity of molasses; on this occasion the Buddha allows the monks to partake of molasses even without being ill (S: pp. 189 *a* 6-190 *a* 6; Dh: pp. 869 *c* 19-870 *a* 23; M: p. 149 *b* 7-26; P: VI, 26; Ms: G. 221, 7-223, 6; Mhs: —).

The legend of the general Siṃha (Siho); here the slander of the adversaries gives to the Buddha the occasion for issuing instructions concerning the use of meat; a monk may consume meat if he has not seen, nor heard, nor supposed that the animal has been killed for his sake (S: p. 190 *b* 1-24; Dh: pp. 871 *b* 7-872 *b* 17; M: p. 149 *b* 27-*c* 25; P: VI, 31; Ms: G. 236, 9-237, 5; Mhs: cf. pp. 485 *c* 21-486 *a* 24; 478 *a* 2-19).

The legend of the householder Meṇḍhaka (Meṇḍako), who along with the members of his family possesses a wonderful boon; here the Buddha permits among other things to take along provisions for travelling (S: pp. 191 *a* 26-192 *c* 9; Dh: pp. 872 *b* 18-873 *a* 24; M: pp. 150 *b* 25-151 *b* 18; P: VI, 34; Ms: G. 241, 1-249, 17; Mhs: —).

The legend of Kaiṇeya (Keniyo), on which occasion the Buddha allows the use of 8 sorts of drinks (S: pp. 192 *c* 19-193 *a* 29; Dh: p. 873 *a* 25-*c* 12; M: p. 151 *b* 19-*c* 10; P: VI, 35; Ms: G. 255, 14-266, 2; Mhs: p. 464 *a* 28-*b* 14).

Lastly the legend of the Malla Roca (Roja); here the Buddha allows the monks to eat cakes (S: p. 193 *b* 22-*c* 15; Dh: pp. 873 *c* 12-874 *a* 13; M: pp. 151 *c* 18-152 *a* 19; P: VI, 36; Ms: G. 282, 1-284, 20; Mhs: —).

Skandhaka text (S: pp. 187 *b* 6-189 *a* 5; Dh: pp. 568 *c* 6-569 *c* 27; cf. p. 864 *b* 24-*c* 16; M: pp. 1 *a* 6-2 *b* 12; P: *Vibhaṅga*, I, 1-4 and *Mahāvagga*, VI, 24; Ms: G. 25, 13-45, 9; Mhs: pp. 462 *c* 25-463 *a* 17 and 477 *a* 13 seq.).

We may add also the story of the old monk, who along with his son gathers by begging a large quantity of food, in order to give a feast to the Buddha and the community; the Buddha forbids it as unbecoming (S: p. 193 *a* 29-*b* 22; Dh: p. 874 *a* 13-25; M: p. 151 *c* 10-17; P: VI, 37; Ms: cf. G. 280, 8-281, 13; Mhs: pp. 463 *a* 17-*b* 2 and 477 *a* 15-18).

7. - Cīvaravastu.

S: 7. *I fa*, pp. 194 *b* 4-206 *b* 26; Dh: 6. *I chien-tu*, pp. 849 *b* 10-866 *b* 23; M: 5. *I fa*, pp. 133 *c* 21-144 *a* 11; P: 8. *Cīvarakkhandaka*, *Mahāvagga* VIII; Ms: 7. *Cīvaravastu*, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. III, Part 2, pp. 1-148; Mhs: *Tsa sung po ch'ü fa*, pp. 453 *b* 5-457 *b* 3; 461 *b* 12-19; 478 *c* 25-480 *a* 14 and 511 *b* 16-512 *a* 1).

The 7th chapter includes the various rules on the clothes of the monks. It is mostly a series of prescriptions, dryly expounded and pieced together without art; there are strong oscillations in both sequence and contents in the various versions. Only a few larger stories allow us to recognize the fixed frame, in which originally everything was set.

In general the rule is that the monk must employ as clothes some discarded rags (S: p. 194 *b* 7 seq.; Dh: p. 849 *b* 11-16; M: — ; P: — ; Ms: — ; Mhs: —). It is laid down in detail what can be considered as refuse and picked up (S: — ; Dh: — ; M: pp. 135 *a* 7-13 and 143 *b* 11-17; P: — Ms: —; Mhs: —), and specially within which limits clothes from cemeteries may be taken and employed (S: — ; Dh: pp. 849 *c* 3-850 *c* 24; M: pp. 134 *b* 15-*c* 27; 136 *b*

20-137 *a* 16 and 142 *c* 16-143 *b* 1; P: VIII, 4; Ms: — ; Mhs: —).

The permission to wear robes given by laymen is introduced by the legend of the physician Jīvaka, which in some versions is spread out in great detail. It ends thus, that Jīvaka attends the Buddha during an illness and on this occasion begs him to be allowed to present him with a valuable robe which he has received. The Buddha accepts the gift and at the same time permits the monks to accept robes from laymen (S: p. 194 *b* 9-*c* 11; Dh: pp. 850 *c* 25-854 *c* 21; M: pp. 133 *c* 25-134 *b* 11; P: VIII, 1, 1-35; Ms: p. 3, 16-48, 15; Mhs: —). There follows, dispersed in some versions through the whole of the chapter, a series of rules on robes which may or may not be worn (S: p. 197 *c* 7-24; Dh: pp. 849 *b* 16-*c* 3; 854 *c* 22-855 *a* 6; 857 *a* 17-27 etc.; M: pp. 137 *a* 17-20; 138 *a* 18-23; 138 *b* 9-11 etc.; P: VIII, 1, 35-36; 2-3; 29; Ms: p. 91, 10-24; Mhs: p. 455 *a* 17-20). A general rule prescribes that such clothes must be given the shape of the monastic robe. This is again introduced by a story. According to some versions the occasion is given by king Bimbisāra, who by mistake shows his veneration to an heterodox whom he holds for a Buddhist monk, and thereupon begs the Buddha to distinguish his monks from the others by the robe. As the Buddha wanders through the fields of Magadha, he points out to Ānanda the many-coloured fields and orders him to give to his robe the same form. Ānanda cuts the robe to pieces and then pieces the single scraps so ably together, that he deserves the applause of the Buddha (S: pp. 194 *c* 12-195 *a* 4; Dh: p. 855 *a* 20-*b* 6; M: p. 137 *a* 21-*b* 2; P: VIII, 12; Ms: p. 49, 1-51, 7; Mhs: pp. 454 *c* 27-455 *a* 1). Accordingly

the clothes given by laymen are to be cut and sewn together into a monk's robe. If their colour does not correspond to a monk's robe, they must be decoloured (S: cf. p. 195 *a* 18-*b* 10; Dh: p. 863*b* 19-22; M: pp. 134 *b* 12-15 and 135 *a* 2-4; P: --- ; Ms: p. 48, 15-20; cf. p. 52, 1-12; Mhs: p. 455 *a* 1-17). Occasionally we find also precise rules on the dyeing of the robes (P VIII, 10-11) or on their size (Dh: pp. 854 *c* 28-855 *a* 2 and 863 *a* 10-15; P: cf. VIII, 21). The number of robes is again justified by a story. During a journey on a cold night the Buddha is compelled to ask from Ānanda a second and then a third robe as a protection against the cold. But that is enough. And since he, who in his youth was brought up in great luxury, finds that three suffice, he prescribes to the monks, some of whom had gathered large quantities of clothes, also three robes only (S: p. 195 *a* 4-18; Dh: pp. 856 *c* 24-857 *a* 12; M: p. 136 *a* 18-*b* 2; P: VIII, 13, 1-5; Ms: p. 51, 7-18; Mhs: —). Single exceptions were regulated separately, such as clothes for the sick (S: pp. 196 *c* 18-197 *a* 5; Dh: pp. 862 *c* 10-25 and 866 *a* 2-6; M: pp. 138 *b* 11 seq.; P: VIII, 17; Ms: p. 90, 12-91, 9; Mhs: —). It is forbidden to go to the village partially clothed (S: p. 198 *a* 29-*b* 25; Dh: p. 863 *a* 17-29; M: pp. 137 *b* 11-15; 138 *b* 12-17 and 135 *c* 5-12; P: VIII, 23; Ms: p. 96, 10-97, 2; Mhs: pp. 511 *b* 16-512 *a* 1). Above all, every clothing that is characteristic of the heterodox is forbidden (S: pp. 197 *c* 24-198 *a* 29; Dh: p. 858 *a* 6-*c* 5; M: pp. 136 *b* 2-16; 138 *a* 23-*b* 8; P: VIII, 28; Ms: p. 91, 18-96, 9; Mhs: p. 454 *c* 9-19).

A large space is taken by the rules on the distribution of clothes and other divisible objects, which are presented to the community chiefly during the retirement of the

rainy season. Firstly the acceptation and conservation of the gifts is regulated (S: — ; Dh: p. 864 *a* 6-27; M: p. 137 *c* 20-29; P: VIII, 5-8; M: — ; Mhs: —). Concerning the distribution itself, the most different cases are provided for: how the distribution must be made among monks who are old residents and those who have just arrived; what should be done if few monks are present or only one; how the distribution is to be made between monks and nuns; which part should go to the novices; what is the procedure in the case of a split in the community etc. (S: pp. 198 *b* 26-202 *b* 4; Dh: pp. 855 *a* 6-17; 858 *c* 6-28; 859 *a* 1-*b* 3; 859 *c* 5-13; 860 *a* 29-*b* 20; 863 *b* 24-*c* 4; p. 864 *a* 27-*b* 4; 864 *b* 20-24 and 864 *c* 16-865 *c* 25; M: pp. 137 *c* 29-138 *a* 8; 138 *b* 20-*c* 4; 139 *b* 10-*c* 15; 140 *b* 3-13; 141 *c* 19-21; 142 *c* 9-16 and 144 *a* 4-11; P: VIII, 9; 24; 25 and 30; Ms: p. 98, 9-113, 10; Mhs [1]: pp. 453 *b* 7-454 *c* 7 and 461 *b* 12-19). Some tales are inserted, such as the story of the monk Upananda (or of the group of the six monks), who wanders from a monastery to the other and takes everywhere an allowance of clothes (S: p. 199 *a* 6-27; Dh: pp. 864 *c* 16-865 *a* 13; M: p. 138 *b* 20-*c* 4; P: VIII, 25, 1-3; Ms: — ; Mhs: p. 453 *b* 28-*c* 5). Eight sorts of gifts are listed (S: p. 200 *b* 1-*c* 26; Dh: pp. 865 *c* 25-866 *a* 2; M: pp. 138 *c* 20-139 *a* 9; P: VIII, 32; Ms: pp. 108, 16-113, 10; Mhs: —). There are some special regulations, such as the permission for the monks to give a portion of abundant presents of clothes to their parents (S: — ; Dh: p. 860 *b* 20 seq.; M: p. 140 *c* 14-20; P: VIII, 22; Ms: — ; Mhs: —). To this context belongs also the legend of the pious lay devotee Viśākhā, who begs

[1] The difference is here very great.

from the Buddha the permission to make regularly certain presents to the community (S: pp. 195 *b* 11-196 *c* 8; Dh: — ; M: p. 140 *b* 20-24; P: VIII, 15; Ms: pp. 52, 13-87, 18; Mhs: —).

A second subject treated in great detail is the division of the heritage of the monks. It finds its place here, because such an heritage consists above all of the robe and the alms-bowl. It is introduced by the story of a sick monk, who is abandoned by all and is attended by the Buddha himself, upon which he lays upon the monks the obligation to take care of the sick (S: pp. 205 *a* 18-206 *b* 18; Dh: pp. 861 *b* 21-862 *a* 1; M: pp. 139 *c* 26-140 *a* 20; P: VIII, 26; Ms: pp. 128, 1-131, 15; Mhs: p. 455 *a* 25-*c* 12 and 455 *c* 12-457 *b* 3). Then it is question of a monk, who dies in spite of every care, and this introduces the subject of heritage. This is to be handed over to the monk who attended the sick; or at least he is to be thought of in the first instance. Then the text deals with large heritages, with objects which may and may not be distributed, and all the questions connected therewith (S: pp. 202 *b* 5-205 *a* 7; Dh: pp. 859 *b* 9-*c* 4; 859 *c* 13-18 and 862 *a* 1-*c* 10; M: pp. 139 *a* 11-*b* 9; 139 *c* 15-25; 140 *a* 20-*b* 2 and 143 *c* 22-25; P: VIII, 27; Ms: pp. 113, 14-127, 18; Mhs: pp. 478 *c* 25-480 *a* 14).

On the side of all these questions of principle, the chapter deals also with several particular cases, such as e.g. when a monk, who is to bring a robe to another, keeps it for his own use because he needs it urgently and is convinced that the sender or the addressee agrees with this (S: cf. 206 *b* 19-25; Dh: p. 866 *a* 21-*b* 17; M: p. 142 *a* 9-21; P: VIII, 31; Ms: pp. 147, 10-148, 20; Mhs: —).

8. – Kaṭhinavastu.

(S: 8. *Chia-ch'ih-na i fa*, pp. 206 *c* 1-214 *a* 15; Dh: 8. *Chia-ch'ih-na i chien-tu*, pp. 877 *c* 5-879 *b* 22; M: 9. *Chia-ch'ih-na i fa*, p. 153 *a* 18-*c* 21; P: 7. *Kaṭhinakkhandhaka*, *Mahāvagga* VII; Ms: 8. *Kaṭhinavastu* (*Chieh-ch'ih-na i shih*), T 1449, pp. 97 *b* 1-99 *a* 13; *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. III, part 2, pp. 149-170; Mhs: *Tsa sung po ch'ü fa*, pp. 452 *a* 7-453 *b* 5).

The short 8th chapter deals with the Kaṭhina procedure, the manifacture and distribution of monastic robes at the end of the rainy season from the gifts received from the laymen. Its contents are as follows.

Immediately after the end of the retirement during the rainy season, a group of monks visits the Buddha, and since their clothes are in bad condition because of the climate, he introduces the Kaṭhina procedure (S: p. 206 *c* 4-20; Dh: p. 877 *c* 6-28; M: p. 153 *a* 22-*b* 2; P: VII, 1, 1-3; Ms: pp. 151, 7-152, 17; Mhs cf. p. 452 *a* 7-15). At the same time he grants to the monks, for the duration of the procedure, some privileges and relaxations of the normal rules (S: — ; Dh: pp. 877 *c* 29-878 *a* 5; M: p. 153*b* 2-4; P: VII, 1, 3; Ms: p. 152, 9-13; Mhs: p. 452 *a* 19-21). Then the period is indicated during which the Kaṭhina procedure should be carried out (S: p. 206 *c* 20-22; Dh: p. 878 *c* 15-22; M: p. 153 *c* 11-16; P: —; Ms: p. 153, 13 seq.; Mhs: p. 452 *a* 16 seq.). The procedure itself is described, the announcement in front of the community, the nomination of a monk as director of the procedure, the handing over to him of the cloths received, the manifacture, di-

stribution and issue of the robes (S: pp. 206 *c* 22-207 *a* 23; Dh: p. 878 *b* 4-*c* 14 and *c* 22-27; M: p. 153 *b* 4-*c* 4 and *c* 16-20; P: VII, 1, 4; Ms: pp. 153, 1-155, 18 and 156, 3-157, 11; Mhs: p. 452 *b* 2-18 and *b* 27-*c* 8). It is also partly prescribed, which words or thoughts should accompany the manifacture of the Kaṭhina robes (S: p. 207 *a* 24-*b* 6; cf. *b* 7-22; Dh: — ; M: — ; P: — ; Ms: pp. 155, 19-156, 3; Mhs: p. 452 *b* 18-27). The text lays down when the Kaṭhina procedure is to be considered as not carried out or as rightly carried out (S: p. 207 *b* 22-*c* 24; Dh: p. 878 *a* 13-29; M: p. 153 *c* 4-7; P: VII, 1, 5-6; Ms: — ; Mhs: pp. 452 *c* 24-453 *a* 6). At the end eight cases are listed, in which the claim of a monk for a Kaṭhina robe is to be considered as extinct (S: p. 207 *c* 25-29; Dh: pp. 878 *c* 27-879 *a* 16; M: p. 153 *c* 7-10; P: VII, 1, 7; Ms: pp. 161, 14-163, 16; Mhs: [1] p. 453 *a* 6-*b* 5). In most versions a grand number of subdivisions of these eight cases are distinguished (S: p. 207 *c* 29-214 *a* 11; Dh: p. 879 *a* 17-*b* 20; M: — ; P: VII, 2-12; Ms: pp. 163, 17-170, 19; Mhs: —); Occasionally two other conditions are mentioned, upon which depends the existence or lapse of the claim (Dh: cf. p. 879 *b* 20 seq.; M: p. 153 *c* 10 seq.; P: VII, 13).

9. – Kośāmbakavastu.

(S: 9. *Chiu-shih-mi fa*, pp. 214 *a* 16-217 *c* 29; Dh: *Chiu-shan-mi chien-tu*, pp. 879 *b* 23-885 *a* 7; M: 11 *b*. *Chieh-mo fa*, pp. 158 *c* 1-161 *a* 13; P: 10. *Kosambakkhandhaka*, *Mahāvagga*, X; Ms: 9. *Kośāmbakavastu*, *Gilgit Manu-*

1) The Mahasāṃghika know 10 cases.

scripts, vol. III, part 2, pp. 171-196; Mhs [1]: *Tsa sung po ch'ü fa*, pp. 439 *b* 22-440 *b* 25 and 440 *b* 25-441 *a* 26; cf. also *Pi-ch'iu sêng chieh fa*, pp. 334 *c* 26-335 *b* 24).

The following series of chapters deals with the law of the community, the several sorts of punishment and the conciliation of disputes between the monks. The series begins with a short chapter, which describes a special case in the form of a continuous narrative.

Following the exclusion of a monk, there arises in Kauśāmbī between two groups of monks a dispute which the Buddha tries in vain to settle (S: pp. 214 *a* 19-215 *b* 6; Dh: pp. 879 *b* 24-880 *b* 15; M: pp. 158 *c* 5-159 *a* 10; P: X, 1; Ms: pp. 173, 6-180, 3; Mhs: —). After a last vain attempt at mediation, during which he narrates the story of Dīrghila and his son Dīrghāyus, the Buddha leaves Kauśāmbī and betakes himself to Śrāvastī (S: p. 215 *b* 7-*c* 6; Dh: pp. 880 *b* 15-882 *c* 26; M: pp. 159 *a* 10-160 *b* 7 P: X, 2-4; Ms: pp. 180, 4-186, 7; Mhs: —). As the laymen of Kauśāmbī quit offering presents to the community, the quarrelling monks too travel to Śrāvastī. Before their arrival the Buddha instructs monks and nuns, male and female lay devotees, how they should behave in front of them (S: pp. 215 *c* 6-216 *c* 17; Dh: 882 *c* 26-883 *c* 2; M: p. 160 *b* 7-*c* 12; P: X, 5, 1-9; Ms: pp. 186, 7-190, 2; Mhs: cf. pp. 439 *b* 22-*c* 24 and 440 *b* 26-*c* 19). In the meantime the excluded monk recognizes his fault and confesses himself guilty. His exclusion, according to the instructions of the Buddha, is then withdrawn and the concord in the community re-established (S: pp. 216 *c* 18-217 *c* 28; Dh: pp. 883 *c* 2-884 *a* 16; M: pp. 160 c 12-161 *a* 11; P:

1) Cf. the Appendix.

X, 5, 10-14; Ms: pp. 190, 3-196, 6; Mhs: cf. pp. 439 *c* 24-440 *b* 25). In several versions there follow now, upon a question by Upāli, general instructions on the establishment of concord in the community (Dh: pp. 884 *a* 16-885 *a* 5; M: p. 161 *a* 11-13; P: X, 6; Mhs: cf. pp. 440 *c* 19-441 *a* 26).

10. – Karmavastu.

(S. 10. *Chan-po fa*, pp. 218 *a* 1-221 *a* 12; Dh: 10. *Chan-po chien-tu*, pp. 885 *a* 8-889 *a* 12; M: 11 *c*. *Chieh-mo fa*, pp. 161 *a* 14-163 *a* 2; P: 9. *Campeyyakkhandhaka*, *Mahāvagga*, IX; Ms: 10. *Karmavastu*, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. III, part 2, pp. 197-211; Mhs: *Tsa sung po ch'iu fa*, pp. 422 *a* 8-*c* 28; 438 *b* 29-439 *a* 5; cf. p. 442 *a* 15-*c* 17 and 443 *b* 5-*c* 4).

The 10th chapter treats the general principles for the various proceedings of the community. It deals with the questions, which sorts of assemblies of the community exist, when they are lawfully composed and for what proceedings they are competent; moreover, what proceedings are to be considered as valid or invalid [1].

It begins with the introductory tale of the monk Senāṃjaya (Kassapagotto), who is expelled without justification by other monks and therefore appeals to the Buddha (S: p. 218 *a* 16-*c* 4; Dh: p. 885 *a* 12-*c* 10; M: p. 161 *a* 14-*b* 21; P: IX, 1; Ms: pp. 199, 4-202, 11; Mhs: —). But the real motive for the intervention of the Buddha

1) In this chapter several textual strata are carelessly mingled together; but at the present situation of our researches I do not wish to make any conjecture on their mutual relations.

is that in Campā [1] the monks in any number undertake community proceedings. Thereupon the Buddha lays down that 4 (5) kinds of assemblies are entitled to carry out community proceedings, viz. those consisting of 4, 5, 10 and 20 or more monks. He also explains who counts as a member in full right of these assemblies and who does not, and determines for which proceedings they are competent (S: pp. 218 *a* 2-15 and 218 *c* 4-219 *c* 29; Dh: pp. 886 *a* 3-*b* 8 and 885 *c* 15-886 *a* 3; M: pp. 161 *c* 6-9 and 162 *c* 13-21; P: IX, 2, 1 and 4, 1-6; Ms: pp. 203,1-206,8; Mhs: p. 422 *a* 9-14 and *b* 3-9). The irregular proceedings of incompetent assemblies cause him to distinguish four kinds of proceedings, according as the community is complete or incomplete and proceeds according to the rules or against them (S: p. 220 *a* 13-*c* 5; Dh: p. 885 *c* 11-15; M: p. 161 *c* 14-17; P: IX, 2; Ms: pp. 202,12-18 and 206, 12-210, 10; Mhs: pp. 422 *a* 18-20 and 438 *c* 2-439 *a* 2). In several versions there follows a further list of 6 (5) kinds of proceedings, as the above mentioned kinds receive the addition of the apparently regular proceedings of a complete or incomplete community (S: — ; Dh: pp. 886 *b* 8-888 *b* 10; M: pp. 161 *c* 18-162 *a* 5; P: IX, 3; Ms: — ; Mhs: —). Then the text explains how these various proceedings are to be employed against monks who are quarrelsome or foolish, whose life is bad, who insult laymen or are guilty of offences which they do not want to recognize and regret (S: — ; Dh: p. 888 *c* 4-19; M: p. 162 *a* 17-*c* 13; P: IX, 7, 1-14; Ms: — ; Mhs: —), and discusses whether these proceedings are to be deemed valid or invalid (S: — ; Dh: p. 888 c 20-29; M: p. 162 *a* 5-16; P:

[1] Hence the name of the chapter in many versions.

IX, 7, 15-20; Ms: — ; Mhs: —). At the end it determines who is entitled to object against a proceeding of the community and who is not (S: p. 220 *c* 6-21; Dh: p. 888 *b* 10-21; M: p. 162 *c* 21-25; P: IX, 4, 7-8; Ms: p. 210, 11-16; Mhs: —), and when the exclusion or the readmission of a monk is lawful or not (S: pp. 220 *c* 21-221 *a* 11; Dh: pp. 888 *c* 29-889 *a* 12; M: pp. 162 *c* 26-163 *a* 2; P: IX, 4, 9-11; Ms: pp. 210, 16-211,3; Mhs: cf. p. 442 *a* 15-*c* 17).

11. – Pāṇḍulohitakavastu [1].

(S: 11. *Pan–ch'a–lu–chia fa*, pp. 221 *a* 13-228 *b* 10; Dh: 11. *Ho chih chien–tu*, pp. 889 *a* 13-896 *b* 24; M: 11 *d*. *Chieh–mo fa*, pp. 163 *a* 2-164 *a* 11; P: 11. *Kammakkhandhaka*, *Cullavagga*, I; Ms: 11. *Pāṇḍulohitakavastu*, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. III, part 3, pp. 3-32,12 [2]; Mhs [3]: *Tsa sung po ch'ü fa*, pp. 422 *c* 28-428 *b* 10 and 439 *a* 6-*b* 20).

The next three chapters deal with the disciplinary proceedings of the community; five important special cases are treated first.

The first one concerns the two monks Pāṇḍuka and Lohitaka, who are a nuisance to the community because of their quarrelsome behaviour and because they incite other monks to quarrelling. They are sentenced to the

[1] Cf. S. LÉVI and ÉD. CHAVANNES, *Quelques titres énigmatiques dans la hiérarchie ecclésiastique du Bouddhisme indien*, in *J. As.*, 1915, 1, pp. 193-223; and S. LÉVI, *Note sur des manuscrits sanscrits provenant de Bamiyan et Gilgit*, in *J. As.*, 1932, 1, pp. 4-8.

[2] In the Gilgit Manuscripts a portion of the *Pudgalavastu* is by mistake joined with the *Pāṇḍulohitakavastu*.

[3] The Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika shows considerable differences. Its conception of the first two disciplinary proceedings is quite another. Besides, in most of the cases it quotes several examples.

tarjanīya karma (*tajjaniyakamma*) (S. pp. 221 *a* 17-222 *b* 13; Dh: pp. 889 *a* 14-890 *b* 21; M: p. 163 *a* 2-*b* 9; P: I, 1-8; Ms: pp. 5, 6-11, 13; Mhs: cf. pp. 422 *c* 28-424 *c* 9 and 439 *a* 8-12).

In the second case it is the monk Śreyaka (Seyyasako) which gives offence to the community by his foolishness and by his continuous rendering himself guilty of misdemeanour. He is sentenced to the *nigurhaṇīya karma* (*nissayakamma*) (S: pp. 222 *b* 14-223 *a* 25; Dh: pp. 891 *b* 21-892 *a* 29; M: — ; P: 1,9-12; Ms: pp. 11, 14-15, 19; Mhs: cf. pp. 424 *c* 9-425 *a* 5 and 439 *a* 12-22).

The third case concerns the monks Aśvaka and Punarvasuka (Assaji and Punabbasuka), who are compromising the community by their scandalous life. They are punished by the *pravāsanīya karma* (*pabbājaniya kamma*) (S: pp. 223 *a* 26-224 *a* 29, cf. p. 290 *a* 1-*c* 15; Dh: pp. 890 *b* 21-891 *b* 21; M: — ; P: 1,13-17; Ms: pp. 15,20-19,8; Mhs: p. 425 *a* 5-10 and 439 *a* 22-25).

The fourth case is that of the monk Uttara (Sudhammo), who insults a lay devotee and is compelled by the *pratisaṃharaṇīya karma* (*paṭisāraniyakamma*) to make amends to him (S: pp. 224 *b* 1-225 *b* 4; Dh: pp. 892 *a* 29-893 *c* 25; M: pp. 163 *b* 10-164 *a* 11; P: I, 18-24; Ms: pp. 19,9-28,6; Mhs: cf. pp. 425 *a* 10-426 *b* 9 and 439 *a* 25-*b* 1).

The fifth punishment, the *utkṣepaṇīya karma* (*ukkhepaniyakamma*) is inflicted in three cases. In the first two it is the monk Chanda (Channo), who first does not want to recognize an offence and then refuses to make amends (S: pp. 225 *b* 5-226 *b* 7 and 226 *b* 8-227 *b* 10; Dh: pp. 894 *a* 5-*c* 2 and 894 *c* 2-895 *b* 2; M: — ; P: 1, 25-30 and 31; Ms: pp. 28,7-29,4 and 29,5-30,2; Mhs: pp. 426 *b* 3-*c* 28 and 426 *c* 28-427 *a* 14). The third case concerns the monk

Arista (Ariṭṭho), who in spite of all exhortations does not give up his heretical opinions (S: pp. 227 *b* 11-228 *b* 8; Dh: pp. 895 *b* 2-896 *b* 24; M: — ; P: I, 32-35; Ms: pp. 30,3-32,12 ; Mhs: cf. pp. 427 *a* 20-428 *b* 10 and 439 *b* 1-20).

In all these disciplinary proceedings the cases concerned give the motive for general rules; in each case it is laid down in detail how the proceedings are to be held, in which cases they are valid or invalid, how the punished monk should behave and how the punishment may be condoned.

This section does not contain inserted tales, but the cases which give occasion to the sentences to punishment are mostly narrated in such detail, that they can be considered as real stories.

12. – Pudgalavastu.

(S: 12 *a*. *Sêng ts'an hui fa*, *K'u ch'ieh chieh–mo*, pp. 228 *b* 11-236 *c* 9; Dh: 12. *Jên chien–tu*, pp. 896 *b* 25-903 *c* 20; M: 11 *a*. *Chieh–mo fa*, pp. 156 *b* 19-158 *b* 25; P: 13. *Samuccayakkhandhaka*, *Cullavagga*, III; Ms: 12. *Pudgalavastu*, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. III, part 3, pp. 32,13-88 [1]; Mhs [2]: *Tsa sung po ch'ü fa*, p. 428 *b* 11-29; pp. 431 *c* 26-432 *c* 20; 433 *b* 6-16; 433 *c* 2-438 *b* 29 and 439 *b* 20-22).

Then follows the discussion of the ordinary proceedings for simple offences. The motive for the issue of the corresponding regulations is given by the monk Udāyī, who becomes guilty of a Saṃghāvaśeṣa offence. For such an

[1] Cf. supra, p. 107, n. 2.

[2] On the rendering of this and of the following chapters in the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika see the appendix.

offence a *mānāpya* (*mānatta*) punishment of six days should be inflicted. After the lapse of six days, the *āvarhaṇa* (*abbhāna*), i.e. the cancellation of punishment, takes place. If the guilty monk has concealed the offence, he must serve a probation period (*parivāsa*) before the *mānāpya*, the duration of which is in relation with the duration of the concealment. The text takes into account also the possibility that the culprit may again commit an offence during the probation period or during the *mānāpya*, that he may commit several offences at the same time, that he conceals them for different periods etc. The case that he may quit the order during the period of punishment is also considered. Then in case of readmission the punishment too is again enforced.

This section contains no inserted stories, nor anything that may be compared to them.

13. – Pārivāsikavastu.

(S: 12 *b*. *Sêng ts'an hui fa*, *Shun hsing fa*, pp. 236 *c* 10-239 *b* 5; Dh: 13. *Fu ts'ang chien-tu*, pp. 904 *a* 1-906 *a* 8; M: 17. *Pieh chu fa*, pp. 181 *b* 5-182 *a* 4; P: 12. *Pārivāsikakkhandhaka*, *Cullavagga*, II; Ms: 13. *Pārivāsikavastu*, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. III, part 3, pp. 91-103; Mhs: *Tsa sung po ch'ü fa*, pp. 432 *c* 20-433 *b* 6 and 433 *b* 16-*c* 2).

This chapter concerns the behaviour during the probation period and the *mānāpya*. The motive for these regulations is given by the group of the six monks, who during the period of punishment behave not differently from the blameless monks. By the rules issued by the Buddha these monks are excluded from several actions

of the community and are in every manner postponed to the blameless ones. They have always to notify to the other monks that they stand in a probation period. In case the observation of the probation period meets with difficulties, a postponement is provided for. The regulations for the monks standing under *mānāpya* differ from those for the monks on probation only in minor particulars. Among other things they have to notify dayly that they stand under *mānāpya*, how many days they have served and how many still remain.

This section too contains no inserted stories.

14. – Poṣadhasthāpanavastu.

(S: 13. *Chih fa*, pp. 239 *b* 6-242 *a* 14; Dh: 14. *Chih chien-tu*, pp. 906 *a* 9-909 *b* 6; M: 16. *Chih po-sa fa*, pp. 180 c 18-181 *b* 4; P: 19. *Pātimokkhaṭhapanakkhandhaka*, *Cullavagga*, IX; Ms: 14. *Poṣadhasthāpanavastu*, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. III, part 3, pp. 105-117; Mhs: *Tsa sung po ch'ü fa*, pp. 447 *b* 11-*c* 2).

Immediately after the description of the disciplinary proceedings, the text deals with the objection against the participation of a monk in the Poṣadha ceremony.

The subject is introduced by the following story. The community is assembled for the Poṣadha ceremony, but the Buddha does not recite the Prātimokṣa inspite of repeated entreaties by Ānanda. Eventually he declares that in the assembly there is an unworthy monk. Maudgalyāyana recognizes through his supernatural powers who is the monk intended, and causes him to be removed. Now the Buddha delivers a sermon on the eight mar-

vellous qualities of the sea and the eight marvellous qualities of his teaching. Then he declares that henceforward he will not preside the Poṣadha ceremony nor recite the Prātimokṣa, but that the community must do it itself (S: pp. 239 *b* 7-240 *a* 19; Dh: pp. 824 *a* 7-825 *a* 11; M: pp. 180 *c* 22-181 *a* 28; P: IX, 1-2; Ms: pp. 107,4 seq.; Mhs: p. 447 *b* 11-*c* 2).

Then he prescribes that a monk, who is guilty of an offence, is not to be allowed to participate in the Poṣadha ceremony. If he tries to do so, objection should be taken (*sthāpana*). This general rule is completed by more detailed bye-laws (S: p. 240 *a* 19-*b* 10; Dh: — ; M: p. 181 *a* 28-*b* 4; P: IX, 2; Ms: p. 107,9-20; Mhs: —).

The action of the group of six monks, who without justification object against the participation of other monks, causes the intervention of the Buddha. He lists from one to ten cases each, in which an objection is lawful or unlawful, and adds many elucidations (S: pp. 240 *b* 11-242 *a* 12; Dh: pp. 906 *a* 25-907 *b* 6; M: — ; P: IX, 3; Ms: pp. 108,11-116,17; Mhs: —). At the end he lays down that an objection should not be at once raised in public, but that the monk concerned is first to be admonished (*codanā*); he enumerates the 5 qualities with which must be endowed a monk who intends to admonish another, etc. [1] (S: — ; Dh: p. 906 *a* 10-25; 907 *b* 6-*c* 6 etc.; M: — ; P: IX, 5; Ms: pp. 107,21-108,10; Mhs: —).

[1] In this chapter it is difficult to find out the original core. Firstly the tradition in later chapters of the *Skandhaka* work is generally speaking inferior. Besides, this chapter stands in the closest possible connection with the 2nd chapter, the *Poṣadhavastu*. The separation of the rules on the objection against participation in the Poṣadha from the other regulations on its performance is quite arbitrary. And indeed the corresponding regulations on objections against participation in the Pravāraṇa ceremony are duly included in

15. – Śamathavastu[1].

(S: 15. *Chêng fa*, pp. 251 *a* 16-256 *b* 23; cf. pp. 141 *b* 12-147 *b* 15; Dh: 16. *Mieh chêng chien-tu*, pp. 913 *c* 12-922 *c* 5; M: 10. *Mieh chêng fa*, pp. 153 *c* 22-156 *b* 18; cf. p. 77 *b* 6-19; P: 14. *Samathakkhandhaka*, *Cullavagga*, IV;

the *Pravāraṇāvastu*. In such circumstances a mutual influence was possible. With the Dharmaguptaka and Mahasāṃghika, we find accordingly the introductory tale not here, but in the *Poṣadhavastu*. On the other side, with the Dharmaguptaka the rules in this chapter show a clear relationship with the rules on the objection against participation in the Pravāraṇa ceremony in the *Pravāraṇāvastu*. And the Mahīśāsaka text after a few short sentences simply refers the reader back to this. The picture of the tradition is thus troubled in the most different ways.

[1] The tradition of this chapter is specially bad; above all in the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin and of the Mahīśāsaka the first part on the introduction by the Buddha of the various conciliation procedures is missing. In the Vinaya of the Mahasāṃghika any corresponding section is lacking. The situation is probably as follows. The Prātimokṣa contains since early times a mention of the 7 *adhikaraṇaśamatha* (S: T 1436, pp. 478 *b* 2 seqq.; Dh: T 1429, pp. 1022 *a* 22 seqq. and T 1431, pp. 1040 *a* 29 seqq.; M: T 1422, pp. 199 *c* 5 seqq. and pp. 205 *c* 19 seqq.; Ms: T 1454, pp. 507 *b* 4 seqq.; Mhs: T 1426, pp. 555 *a* 25 seqq.). The explanations given by the *Vibhaṅga* are as a rule quite short (Dh: T 1428, pp. 713 *c* 21 seqq.; P: Vinaya vol. IV, p. 207; Ms: T 1442, pp. 904 *b* 5 seqq.). With the Sarvāstivādin the discussion of the conciliation procedure is missing in the *Skandhaka*, but a large corresponding section is to be found in this part of the *Vibhaṅga*. But in the *Skandhaka* the discussion of the conciliation procedure could not have been originally missing, since also the section on the four motives of dispute, preserved with the Sarvāstivādin, implies it as well known. We have therefore to conclude that the discussion of the conciliation procedure in the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin was later on transposed from the *Skandhaka* into the *Vibhaṅga*. It is therefore one of the redactional modifications that are often to be found in this Vinaya. In the Vinaya of the Mahīśāsaka a corresponding section is completely lacking, but the discussion of the conciliation procedure in the *Vibhaṅga* (T 1421, p. 77 *b* 6-19) contains a short notice on the place and the persons who gave the motive for the introduction of the several procedures. These narratives must therefore have been known at first also to the tradition of this school. The Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika has gone its own ways. It contains a section, corresponding to this

Ms: 16. *Śamathavastu*; Mhs: *Pi ch'iu sêng chieh fa*, pp. 327 *a* 25-335 *b* 27 and *Tsa sung po ch'iu fa*, pp. 441 *c* 7-442 *a* 11).

The 15th chapter contains the description of the various procedures to be followed in order to conciliate disputes between the monks. It is divided in two parts. The first speaks of the introduction of those procedures by the Buddha, which took place about in the following way.

The action of the group of the six monks against absentees gives the occasion for initiating the procedure in the presence (of the accused) (*sammukhāvinayo*) (S: p. 142 *a* 3-*b* 25; Dh: pp. 913 *c* 16-914 *a* 4; M: cf. p. 77 *b* 7 seq.; P: IV, 1-3; Mhs: pp. 327 *b* 17-328 *c* 11) [1].

The unjust accusation against the monk Dabbo Mallaputto of having sinned with the nun Mettiyā, causes the Buddha to introduce the procedure on the base of the conscience (of the own innocence) (*sativinayo*), by which the accused purges himself of suspicion (S: pp. 142 *b* 26-143 *a* 26; Dh: p. 914 *a* 4-*b* 15; M: cf. p. 77 *b* 8-10; P: IV, 4; Mhs: pp. 328 *c* 14-329 *a* 20).

In order to protect a monk, who was mentally deranged and has recovered, against further reproaches for the offences committed during insanity, the Buddha introduces the procedure for the no-longer-insane (*amūḍhavinayo*) (S: p. 143 *a* 27-*c* 15; Dh: p. 914 *b* 15-*c* 29; M: cf. p. 77 *b* 11 seq.; P: IV, 5-6; Mhs: p. 332 *a* 10-*c* 16).

chapter of the *Skandhaka*, in the *Vibhaṅga*, 4th Pātayantika offence (T 1425, pp. 327 *a* 25-335 *b* 27). The description of the sevenfold procedure for the conciliation of disputes is inserted into the doctrine of the four motives of dispute.

1) The narratives show great differences in the several versions. According to the Dharmaguptaka, the accusation of having unlawfully appropriated a robe gives the first motive for the issue of the regulation, while according to the Sarvāstivādin the same accusation causes the institution of the procedure based on the culprit's own declaration (*patiññātakaraṇa*).

The unjust proceedings against a monk, who had confessed an offence, causes the Buddha to introduce the procedure on the ground of the own admission (*paṭiññātakaraṇa*) (S: pp. 141 *b* 13-142 *a* 2; Dh: pp. 914 *b* 29-915 *a* 27; M: cf. p. 77 *b* 12-14; P: IV, 7-8; Mhs: pp. 332 *c* 18-333 *b* 6) [1].

Against a monk who on being questioned gives contradictory answers and consciously lies, the Buddha introduces the procedure against obstinacy (*tassapāpiyyasikā*) [2] (S: pp. 143 *c* 16-144 *a* 22; Dh: p. 915 *b* 2-*c* 10; M: cf. p. 77 *b* 18 seq.; P: IV, 11-12; Mhs: pp. 333 *b* 6-*c* 24 and 441 *c* 7-442 *a* 11).

When among the monks a dispute breaks out, which it is not possible to appease, the Buddha orders that the majority should decide (*yebhuyyasikā*). Voting takes place through voting tablets and a suitable monk is to be appointed to collect the tablets (S: pp. 144 *a* 23-147 *a* 15 [3]; Dh: p. 915 *a* 27-*b* 2; M; cf. p. 77 *b* 15 seq.; P: IV, 9-10; Mhs: pp. 333 *c* 25-334 *c* 26).

When during a dispute the quarrelling monks themselves fear that it might degenerate and therefore address themselves to the Buddha, he institutes the procedure of the covering with grass (*tiṇavatthārako*). In this every group of the quarrelling monks purges its own offences,

1) The disagreement between the single narratives is here most serious. I suppose that the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka employed the story whose original place was here, in order to justify the *sammukhāvinayo*: in its place it inserted here a stopgap drawn from the *Poṣadhavastu* (p. 824 *a* 7 seqq.); cf. the preceding foot note.

2) The expression is not clear. I have followed the interpretation of H. Oldenberg.

3) The disproportionately long description in the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin is taken from the second part (p. 252 *b* 10 seqq.), because only there the discussion on the various procedures of conciliation finds its right place.

and the question is thus considered as settled (S: p. 147 *a* 16-*b* 15; Dh: p. 915 *c* 11-20; M: cf. p. 77 *b* 14-18; P: IV, 13; Mhs: pp. 334 *c* 26-335 *b* 24) [1].

The following second part speaks of the motives for the various procedures of conciliations. Four such motives are distinguished; those deriving from discussions (*vivādādhikaraṇa*), from reproaches addressed to somebody (*anuvādādhikaraṇa*), from offences (*āpattādhikaraṇa*) and from community life (*kiccādhikaraṇa*). All four are discussed in detail; and investigation is made as to what is their root, when they are beneficial, non beneficial or indifferent, which discussions, reproaches, offences and happenings of community life give occasion to conciliation procedures and which do not, and above all which procedure is to be employed for the several occasions and how it is to be carried out. In connection with the decision by majority (*yebhuyyasikā*) the text explains in minute detail which attempts at conciliation must be made before proceeding to the vote (S: pp. 251 *a* 19-256 *b* 22; Dh: pp. 915 *c* 21-922 *c* 5; M: pp. 153 *c* 26-156 *b* 18; P: IV, 14).

No legends or long stories are contained in this chapter.

16. – Saṃghabhedavastu.

(S: 16. *T'iao-ta shih*, pp. 257 *a* 1-267 *a* 21, cf. pp. 24 *b* 22-25 *c* 15; Dh: 15. *P'o sêng chien-tu*, pp. 909 *b* 7-913 *c* 11, cf. pp. 590 *b* 13-595 *c* 1; M: 12. *P'o sêng fa*, pp. 164 *a* 13-166 *b* 7, cf. pp. 16 *c* 21-21 *a* 1; P: 17. *Saṃghabhedakkhandhaka*, *Cullavagga*, VII, cf. *Suttavibhaṅga*, *Saṃghādi-*

[1] The description of the Mahāsāṃghika makes use of the *Kośāmbakavastu*.

sesa 10; Ms: 17. *Saṃghabhedavastu* (*P'o sêng shih*,) T 1450, pp. 99 *a* 14-206 *a* 15, cf. T 1442, pp. 700 *c* 29-704 *b* 26; Gilgit Manuscripts, Vol. III, Part 4, p. 211-255; Mhs: *Tsa sung po ch'ü fa*, pp. 442 *c* 28-443 *a* 26, 440 *c* 19-441 *a* 26 and 489 *c* 9-25, cf. *Pi-ch'iu sêng chieh fa*, pp. 281 *c* 12-283 *b* 14) [1].

The 16th chapter concerns splits in the community. It is introduced by the legend of Devadatta, which in some versions is narrated in great detail. This enlarged form of the legend does not belong in my opinion to the body of the old *Skandhaka* work; nevertheless on account of its importance I shall mention it in a few sentences [2].

The influent Śākya Aniruddha and Bhadrika along with some other young Śākya, among whom Devadatta,

[1] I quote here, besides the *Saṃghabhedavastu*, also the sections of the *Vibhaṅga* containing the legend of Devadatta.

[2] This is not the place for enlarging upon the origin and development of the legend of Devadatta. I limit therefore myself to giving a short account of what is, in my opinion, its nature.

The legend of Devadatta plays a role above all in two passages of the Vinaya, in the *Vibhaṅga* concerning the tenth Saṃghāvaśeṣa offence, and in the *Saṃghabhedavastu* of the *Skandhaka*. The fuller form of the legend appears partly in the *Vibhaṅga*. In this case the *Saṃghabhedavastu* contains merely a short account (thus Dh and M). Or it stands in the *Saṃghabhedavastu*, and then the *Vibhaṅga* is content with a short narrative (thus S and P; Ms has conformed. The Mahāsāṃghika give the fuller form in the *Ekottarikāgama*).

This situation must have arisen in the following manner. The earliest Vinaya tradition spoke of Devadatta in connection with the 10th Saṃghāvaśeṣa offence of the Prātimokṣa. According to it Devadatta was said to have attempted, along with four companions, to split the community on the basis of a reform of the monastic rules in five points, destined to make them more stringent. As he did not forego his attempt in spite of repeated admonishment, the Buddha issued the following rule: If a monk tries to split the community, he must be admonished thrice to renounce his intentions; if nevertheless he cannot be dissuaded, then he renders himself guilty of a Saṃghāvaśeṣa offence.

The author of the *Skandhaka* rounded this off to a connected story. According to him Devadatta had at first success among the younger monks;

betake themselves, followed by the barber Upāli, to the Buddha and enter the monastic order (S: — ; Dh: pp. 590 *b* 13-591 *c* 16; M: pp. 16 *c* 21-17 *c* 14; P: VII, 1; Ms: pp. 144 *b* 9-147 *b* 22). Devadatta obtains miraculous powers and thereby gains the favour of the crown prince Ajātaśatru, who covers him with presents (S: p. 257 *a* 4-*c* 16; Dh: p. 592 *a* 9-20; M: pp. 17 *c* 15-18 *a* 2; P: VII, 2, 1; Ms: pp. 167 *c* 26-168 *c* 23). The monks tell this to the Buddha, who explains to them that Devadatta harms only himself by his actions (S: pp. 257 *c* 17-258 *a* 9; Dh: p. 592 *a* 20-*b* 1; M: p. 18 *a* 23-*b* 10; P: VII, 2, 5; Ms: pp. 168 *c* 23-169 *a* 11). In the meantime the son of the gods Kakudha informs Maudgalyāyana of the schemes of Devadatta, and he in his turn tells the Buddha (S: p. 258 *a* 9-27; Dh: pp. 591 *c* 25-592 *a* 8; M: p. 18 *a* 2-13; P: VII, 2, 2; Ms: p. 169 *a*

he succeeded in gaining 500 followers, with whom he founded a community of his own. But Śāriputra and Maudgalyayana convinced these monks to return to the Buddha, whereupon Devadatta died of blood vomiting.

Alongside these Vinaya stories, a detailed legend of Devadatta arose, the outlines of which are as follows. Devadatta, who through assiduous exertions had gained miraculous powers, gained through them the favour of the crown prince Ajātaśatru, who showered presents upon him. Misled by this success, he invited the Buddha to hand over to him the direction of the community. Upon the latter's refusal he tried to act independently, but had little success, above all because the Buddha was always consistently supported by king Bimbisāra. Then he instigated Ajātaśatru to kill his own father, while he himself engineered the most various schemes against the Buddha. As all these attempts failed and even Ajataśatru was gained over by the Buddha, he made personally a last desperate attempt to poison the Buddha; but the earth swallowed him up and he was precipitated in hell.

At an early time, probably even before Aśoka, this legend was included in the Vinaya, by some schools in the *Vibhaṅga* and by others in the *Skandhaka*, and was mixed up with the older stories. Also other material from the *Vibhaṅga* was employed (Saṃghavaśeṣa 11 and Pātayantika 36 [32]). But the composite character of the account, which came into being in this way, still appears in several contradictions and inequalities, as e.g. the doubling of the attempt to split the community, the different accounts of Devadatta's end etc.

12-*b* 18). Shortly afterwards Devadatta calls upon the Buddha to leave to him the direction of the community, but gets a refusal (S: p. 258 *a* 28-*b* 14; Dh: p. 592 *b* 5-17; M: p. 18 *b* 11-23; P: VII, 3, 1; Ms: p. 169 *b* 19-29). In this connection the Buddha delivers the sermon on the five kinds of teachers (S: pp. 258 *b* 14-259 *a* 8; Dh: p. 593 *a* 10-29; M: p. 18 *a* 13-22; P: VII, 2, 3-4; Ms: pp. 169 *c* 5-170 *b* 24). Now Devadatta tries to act independently and to found a community of his own (S: cf. p. 259 *a* 9-*c* 14; Dh: — ; M: p. 18 *b* 23 seq.; P: — ; Ms: cf. pp. 170 *b* 24-172 *b* 19). Thereupon the Buddha causes to be proclaimed that he and the community have nothing to do with the action of Devadatta (S: p. 260 *c* 2-11; Dh: p. 593 *a* 29-*c* 1; M: p. 19 *a* 5-23; P: VII, 3, 2-3; Ms: p. 173 *c* 9-21). Devadatta meets with but little success, and above all the king Bimbisāra continues to support the Buddha (cf. Dh: p. 592 *b* 1-5). Because of this Devadatta tries to induce the crown prince Ajātaśatru to dethrone his father Bimbisāra and to help him to eliminate the Buddha. Ajātaśatru follows these suggestions and makes himself king in the place of his father (S: pp. 260 *c* 11-262 *a* 10; Dh: pp. 592 *b* 17-23 and 593 *c* 1-594 *a* 1; M: p. 19 *a* 23-*b* 23; P: VII, 3, 4-5; Ms: pp. 187 *c* 20-188 *a* 2 and 189 *a* 15-190 *b* 22). Now Devadatta sends murderers to kill the Buddha, but the latter converts them (S: p. 260 *b* 9-25; Dh: p. 592 *b* 23-*c* 23; M: pp. 19 *c* 27-20 *a* 14; P: VII, 3, 6-8; Ms: —). Then he attempts to kill the Buddha with a rock, but merely wounds his foot (S: p. 260 *a* 13-*b* 8; Dh: p. 592 *c* 23-29; M: p. 20 *a* 22-*b* 2; P: VII, 3, 9; Ms: pp. 192 *a* 14-193 *a* 29). When the monks grow excited because of this attempt, the Buddha calms them down (S: p. 260 *b* 25-*c* 2; Dh: pp. 592 *c* 29-593 *a* 10; M: p. 20 *a*

15-21; P: VII, 3, 10; Ms: cf. p. 201 *b* 25-*c* 5). Then Devadatta incites a mad elephant against the Buddha but the latter tames it (S: p. 262 *a* 11-*c* 19; Dh: — ; M: p. 19 *b* 24-*c* 26; P: VII, 3, 11-12; Ms: pp. 197 *b* 28-199 *a* 4). In the meantime the behaviour of the followers of Devadatta causes the Buddha to forbid that more than three monks should beg their food together (S: pp. 259 *c* 14-260 *a* 12; Dh: p. 594 *a* 1-19; M: — ; P: VII, 3, 13; Ms: —). Now Devadatta, in order to split the community, proposes to render the rules more stringent in five points. The Buddha rejects them (S: p. 264 *b* 20-*c* 16; Dh: — ; M: — ; P: VII, 3, 14-16; Ms: —). Thereupon Devadatta organizes a voting upon these five points. 500 young monks follow him, and he founds with them a separate community (S: p. 265 *a* 12-*b* 9; Dh: p. 909 *b* 8-18; M: p. 164 *b* 5-14; P: VII, 4, 1; Ms: p. 202 *c* 5-28; Mhs: cf. pp. 442 *c* 29-443 *a* 26). But Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana lead the 500 monks back to the Buddha, and when Devadatta hears of this, he spits blood and dies (S: pp. 265 *b* 9-266 *a* 12; Dh: pp. 909 *c* 13-910 *a* 11; M: p. 164 *b* 15-*c* 15; P: VII, 4, 1-3; Ms: pp. 202 *c* 28-203 *b* 14). Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana in the meantime reach with the 500 monks the Buddha. The latter tells them a Jātaka of a large and a little elephant (S: — ; Dh: p. 910 *b* 17-*c* 17; M: pp. 164 *c* 15-165 *a* 2; P: VII, 4, 4-5; Ms: cf. p. 203 *b* 14-*c* 5). Then he speaks to the monks about the bad qualities of Devadatta and the sad end they led him to (S: — ; Dh: p. 909 *b* 18-*c* 13; M: p. 166 *a* 8-14; P: VII, 4, 7-8; Ms: cf. pp. 150 *a* 28-151 *a* 20 and pp. 236,4-240,3). The legend of Devadatta is thus at an end. The numerous Jātaka inserted in the various versions have been left out of account.

The legend of Devadatta is followed by a general treatise on splits in the community, under the form of an instruction to Upāli. It discusses the difference between difference of opinion (*saṃgharāji*) and split of the community (*saṃghabhedo*), and determinates who can cause a split of the community, what is the basis of a split or of the concord of the community, which is the retribution of the man who splits the community or who reunites a split community (S: pp. 266 *b* 15-267 *a* 21; Dh: p. 913 *b* 2-*c* 10; M: p. 166 *a* 14-*b* 7; P: VII, 5; Ms: pp. 153 *b* 4-155 *b* 9 and pp. 248,12-255,6; Mhs: pp. 440 c 19-441 *a* 26 and 489 *c* 9-25).

17. – Śayanāsanavastu.

(S: 14. *Wo chü fa*, pp. 242 *a* 15-251 *a* 15; Dh: 19. *Fang shih chien–tu*, pp. 936 *b* 18-945 *a* 19; M: 13. *Wo chü fa*, pp. 166 *b* 8-169 *a* 23; P: 16. *Senāsanakkhandhaka*, *Cullavagga*, VI; Ms: 15. *Śayanāsanavastu*, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. III, part 3, pp. 119-144 [1]; Mhs: *Tsa sung po ch'ü fa*, pp. 443 *c* 4-446 *c* 3 and 415 *a* 29-*c* 8).

The last chapters of the *Skandhaka* assume more and more the character of addenda. The 17th chapter, concerning the dwelling huts for the community and their furniture, still represents a unity. The reason why it is not included in the first part of the work among the chapters regulating the general life of the monks, is perhaps that life in monasteries gained greater importance only in the course of time [2].

[1] The text is incomplete and stops abruptly in the middle of the legend of Anāthapiṇḍada.

[2] The Mahāsāṃghika in their Vinaya have, characteristically enough, shifted forward this section.

The introductory story tells of a householder in Rājagṛha, who sees how the monks come from the forest, in which they dwell, to the town on their alms-begging tour, and thereupon offers to have buildings erected for their use (S: p. 243 *a* 21-*b* 5; Dh: pp. 936 *b* 22-937 *a* 21; M: p. 166 *b* 9-*c* 9; P: VI, 1; Ms: pp. 132,9-133,5; Mhs: —). On this occasion shape and furnishing of the buildings are discussed (S: p. 243 *b* 5-*c* 19; Dh: pp. 937 *a* 21-938 *b* 20; cf. pp. 940 *c* 15-941 *b* 8 and 941 *c* 4-943 *a* 18; M: cf. pp. 167 *b* 19-168 *b* 7 [1]; P: VI, 2-3; Ms: pp. 133,6-13; Mhs: —). Then follows the legend of Anāthapiṇḍada, a rich merchant from Śrāvastī, who presents to the community the magnificent Jetavana. Anāthapiṇḍada is staying at Rājagṛha, and there he sees how the friend who gives him hospitality is making great preparations in order to feed the Buddha and the community. He grows interested, visits the Buddha before daybreak and is converted by him. Then the texts tell the well known story of the donation of the Jetavana at Śrāvastī and of the institution of the monastery there (S: pp. 243 *c* 20-245 *a* 3; Dh: pp. 938 *b* 20-939 *c* 15 and 941 *b* 8-*c* 4; M: pp. 166 *c* 10-167 *b* 19; P: VI, 4 and 9; Ms: pp. 133,13-144; Mhs: p. 415 *a* 29-*c* 8). During the journey of the community to Śrāvastī, the behaviour of the group of six monks, who take for themselves the best rooms available, gives to the Buddha motive to enjoin due regard to seniority. On this occasion he tells the story of the pheasant, the monkey and the elephant [2]. Then it is question of the misuse of seniority and how the

[1] Here, as many times in this Vinaya, the most different regulations are thrown together.

[2] Cf. Ét. Lamotte, *La conduite religieuse du faisan dans les textes bouddhiques*, in *Muséon*, 59, 1946, pp. 641-653; and Id., *Traité*, II, p. 718 n.

Buddha puts a remedy to it (S: pp. 242 *a* 18-243 *a* 21 and 245 *a* 3-*b* 3; Dh: pp. 939 *c* 15-940 *c* 4; M: p. 121 *a* 2-25; P: VI, 6-7 and 10; Ms: pp. 121,5-132,8; Mhs: pp. 445 *c* 22-446 *c* 3). Other abuses by the group of six monks induce the Buddha to prescribe the nomination of a monk in charge of the assignment of dwelling rooms and objects of furniture. His duties and several questions connected with the allotment of community property are treated in detail in some versions (S: pp. 245 *b* 3-246 *c* 8 and 247 *a* 2-*c* 23; Dh: p. 943 *b* 26-*c* 29; M: p. 167 *c* 20-27 and 168 *c* 8-169 *a* 4; P: VI, 11-12 and 15-16; Mhs: p. 445 *b* 5-*c* 22). In the same way as the allocator of the dwelling rooms, other monks can be entrusted with different kinds of offices. An important office is that of the superintendent of building (*navakarmika*). His duty is to superintend on behalf of the community the execution of buildings, which lay devotees cause to be erected for the community. Already upon the construction of the Jetavana monastery this charge was entrusted to Śāriputra. Later the tasks and duties of the superintendent of building were regulated in a precise manner (S: pp. 244 *b* 22 seqq. and 247 *c* 24-248 *a* 13; Dh: pp. 944 *a* 6-*b* 19 and 944 *c* 4-945 *a* 2; M: pp. 167 *a* 13 seqq. and 169 *a* 7-22; P: VI, 5 and 17; Ms: pp. 143,22 seqq.; Mhs: pp. 415 *c* 3 seqq. and 445 *a* 4-*b* 5). In some cases laymen erected buildings for a specified monk. This too could lead to difficulties. So we are told how a devotee builds a house for the monk Rāhula, and later, when the latter absents himself for a long time, hands it over to another monk. The case is settled by the intervention of the Buddha (S: — ; Dh: p. 943 *a* 18-*b* 26; M: p. 168 *b* 8-*c* 7; P: — ; Mhs: pp. 444 *c* 18-445 *a* 3). In order to avoid long periods of non-occupation and the

consequent decay of monastic buildings, it is permissible to choose a monk, who has to take his permanent residence there. This is put in the form of a tale, how wandering monks come to a monastery which stands abandoned, although the laymen of the neighbourhood would be willing enough to take care of the monks; whereupon the Buddha decides accordingly (S: pp. 249 *c* 5-250 *a* 5; Dh: p. 940 *c* 4-15; M: p. 167 *b* 27-29; P: — ; Mhs: —). In several versions there is mention of many other offices that can be entrusted to the monks. Thus we hear of monks whose duty is to distribute clothes, food or drugs. Others have the care of assigning sleeping places to newcomers. Others again must allot the works and duties in the monastery etc. [1] (S: pp. 248 *a* 14-249 *c* 4 and 250 *a* 21-251 *a* 14; Dh: p. 945 *a* 5-18; M: — ; P: VI, 21; Mhs: —).

18. – Ā c ā r a v a s t u .

(S: 17 *c. Tsa fa*, pp. 298 *a* 26-302 *c* 8; Dh: 18. *Fa chien–tu*, pp. 930 *c* 6-936 *b* 17; M: 15. *Wei i fa*, pp. 177 *a* 1-180 *c* 17; P: 18. *Vattakkhandhaka*, *Cullavagga*, VIII; Ms: 18. *Kṣudrakavastu* (*Tsa shih*), T 1451, pp. 374 *c* 29-382 *b* 28; Mhs: *Wei i fa*, pp. 499 *a* 18-514 *a* 18) [2].

The 18th chapter contains rules on the behaviour of the monks, as far as it was not yet provided for in the preceding portions of the work. This includes behaviour

[1] Here the data of the several versions fluctuate considerably. Apparently these regulations were subjected to deep-reaching modifications in the course of time.

[2] In this and the following chapter I forego to list the isolated cases of agreement of this Vinaya.

on the alms-begging tour (S: pp. 298 *a* 27-299 *a* 6; Dh: pp. 932 *b* 29-933 *c* 6; M: pp. 177 *c* 22-178 *c* 5; P: VII, 5; Ms: p. 375 *a* 3-28;), at meals in the homes of laymen (S: p. 299 *a* 7-*b* 7; Dh: pp. 934 *c* 24-936 *a* 2; M: p. 179 *a* 27-*c* 16; P: VIII, 4; Ms: pp. 375 *a* 29-376 *a* 26), towards monks freshly arrived (S: p. 300 *a* 11-*b* 15 and *c* 7-19; Dh: pp. 930 *c* 7-931 *c* 28; M: pp. 178 *c* 5-179 *a* 26; P: VIII, 1-3; Ms: p. 381 *a* 18-*c* 24), towards monks who dwell in the forest (S: pp. 300 *c* 20-301 *a* 27; Dh: pp. 933 *c* 6-934 *c* 24; M: pp. 179 *c* 17-180 *a* 24; P: VIII, 6; Ms: pp. 377 *c* 9-378 *a* 18) etc.

The several sections are often introduced by short tales. Thus we are told how a monk on his begging tour enters imprudently a house and thereby falls under suspicion to have sinned with a woman; and this gives occasion for the regulations on the behaviour on the begging tour. Or it is related how monks dwelling in the forest meet with robbers and behave so clumsily, that the robbers take them for false monks and ill-treat them, whereupon the Buddha issues rules for the monks who dwell in the forest. True legends are lacking in this chapter.

19. – K ṣ u d r a k a v a s t u .

(S: 17 *a*. *Tsa fa*, pp. 267 *a* 22-290 *c* 20; Dh: 20. *Tsa chien-tu*, pp. 945 *a* 20-966 *a* 11; M: 14. *Tsa fa*, pp. 169 *b* 1-176 *c* 23; P: 15. *Khuddakavatthukkhandhaka*, *Cullavagga*, V; Ms: 18 *a*. *Kṣudrakavastu* (*Tsa shih*), T 1451, pp. 207 *a* 16-297 *b* 24 and 324 *c* 15-328 *c* 25; Mhs: *Tsa sung po ch'ü fa*, cf. 461 *b* 19-499 *a* 17).

The 19th chapter is defined as addendum already by its title. It gathers together a large number of rules,

who could not be placed anywhere else and which mostly concern subjects of minor importance. Thus there is question of the nature of the begging bowls, of the use of toothpicks, of the furniture and use of washrooms etc. Here too we find inserted some longer tales, above all the legend of Piṇḍola Bharadvāja, who through the use of supernatural powers puts himself in possession of a precious begging bowl (S: pp. 268 *c* 12-269 *b* 4; Dh: p. 946 *b* 13-*c* 25; M: p. 170 *a* 3-*c* 24; P: V, 8; Ms: p. 213 *b* 27-*c* 22; Mhs: cf. p. 462 *a* 14-*b* 15)[1], the story of how king Bimbisāra permits the monks to pick mango fruits from his garden, and how they misuse the permission so shamelessly, that no single fruit is left for the king himself (S: p. 268 *a* 22-*b* 28; Dh: p. 963 *b* 11-21; M: pp. 170 *c* 24-171 *a* 6; P: V, 5, 1; Ms: pp. 209 *c* 18-210 *a* 28; Mhs: p. 478 *a* 20-*b* 5), the story of the layman who falsely accuses the monk Dabbo Mallaputto of a serious offence, whereupon the community "turns the begging bowl" before him, i.e. breaks off relations and accepts no more alms from him (S: pp. 270 *c* 15-271 *c* 5; Dh: pp. 958 *c* 15-960 *a* 7; M: pp. 174 *c* 5-175 *a* 23; P: V, 20; Ms: p. 220 *a* 5-*c* 17; Mhs: cf. pp. 483 *c* 9-484 *b* 20), then the story of the monk who is bitten by a snake, whereupon the Buddha teaches the monks a spell for appeasing the various families of serpents (S: — ; Dh: pp. 870 *c* 22-871 *a* 8; M: p. 171 *a* 16-28; P: V, 6; Ms: *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. III, part 1, pp. 285,8-288,20; Mhs: —)[2] etc.

[1] Cf. S. Lévi, *Les Seize Arhats protecteurs de la Loi*, in *J. As.*, 1916, II, pp. 232 seqq.

[2] In the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka and of the Mūlasarvāstivādin this tale stands in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*. I quote it because later it was taken over into the well known and diffused *Mahāmāyūrī-vidyārājñī*, and because its inclusion in several Vinaya is a witness to its early age (cf. S. Lévi, *Le*

Of course this chapter was more exposed than any other to amplifications and additions. And accordingly these are found in large quantities. Above all some versions have included bulky legends [1] and with the Mūlasarvāstivādin this chapter together with the *Saṃghabhedavastu* has served as basis for the biography of the Buddha, which in that school forms the ending portion of the *Skandhaka* [2].

20. – Bhikṣuṇīvastu.

(S: 17 *b*. *Tsa fa* (*Pi-ch'iu-ni fa*), pp. 290 *c* 21-298 *a* 25; Dh: 17. *Pi-ch'iu-ni chien-tu*, pp. 922 *c* 6-930 *c* 5; M: 19. *Pi-ch'iu-ni fa*, pp. 185 *b* 1-190 *b* 9; P: 20. *Bhikkhunikkhandhaka*, *Cullavagga* X; Ms: 18 *b*. *Kṣudrakavastu* (*Tsa shih*). T 1451, pp. 350 *b* 7-374 *c* 28; Mhs: *Tsa sung po ch'ü fa*, pp. 471 *a* 25-476 *b* 11).

With the chapter of addenda of the *Kṣudrakavastu* the description of the Buddhist monastic rules is at an end, as far as the monks are concerned. There follows now as conclusion a chapter dealing with the nuns and containing the rules meant specially for them.

This chapter is introduced by the story, how the Buddha allows himself to be convinced by the prayers of his foster-mother Mahāprajāpatī and by the intercession of his favourite disciple Ānanda to establish the order of nuns. At the same time he issues the eight severe rules

Catalogue géographique des Yakṣa dans la Mahâmāyūrī, in *J. As.*, 1915, I, pp. 19-1938; further literature quoted there).

1) E.g. M: p. 172 *a* 3-*c* 23 (The 11 dreams of king Chin-mei), Dh: pp. 961 *b* 11-962 *b* 22 (king Udayana and Mahākatyāyana); Ms: pp. 297 *b* 7-324 *c* 11 (Mahākātyāyana and king Caṇḍapradyota).

2) Cf. the Appendix.

by which the female order is subordinated to the male order (S: — ; Dh: pp. 922 c 7-923 c 12; M: pp. 185 a 5-186 a 27; P: X, 1; Ms: pp. 350 b 10-351 a 25; Mhs; p. 471 a 25-28). Then follow the rules for the admission to the nun order, for the confession ceremony and the Pravāraṇā ceremony, which correspond with few modifications and additions to the rules for the male order. In all this cases the behaviour towards the male order is always specially regulated. Care is taken also of the sermons to the nuns, for which suitable monks should be sent. The rest of the chapter is occupied by lesser regulations.

With the exception of the introductory narrative, no considerable legends are included in this chapter.

Conclusion.

(S: *Shan sung p'i-ni hsü* [*Wu pei pi-ch'iu chieh chi san tsung fa p'in* and *Ch'i pei pi-ch'iu chi mieh o fa p'in*], pp. 445 c 8-456 b 8; Dh: *Chi fa pi-ch'iu wu pei jên* and *Ch'i pei chi fa p'i-ni*, pp. 966 a 12-971 c 3; M: *Wu pei chi fa* and *Ch'i pei chi fa*, pp. 190 b 10-194 b 21; P: *Pañcasatikakkhandhaka* and *Sattasatikakkhandhaka*, *Cullavagga* XI-XII; Ms: 18. *Kṣudrakavastu* (*Tsa shih*), T 1451, pp. 382 b 29-414 b 19; Mhs: *Tsa sung po ch'ü fa*, pp. 489 c 26-493 c 11).

1. The death of the Buddha (*Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*) (S: pp. 445 c 10-447 a 11; Dh: p. 966 a 15-c 11; M: — ; P: — ; Ms: pp. 382 b 29-402 c 4; Mhs: pp. 489 c 26-490 b 21)[1].

[1] Cf. E. Waldschmidt, *Die Ueberlieferung vom Lebensende des Buddha, eine vergleichende Analyse des* Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra *und seiner Textentsprechungen* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, phil.-hist. Klasse, Dritte Folge, Nr. 29-30), Göttingen 1944-48.

2. The council of Rājagṛha (S: pp. 447 *a* 12-450 *a* 26; Dh: pp. 966 *c* 11-968 *c* 17; M: pp. 190 *b* 13-192 *a* 25; P: XI; Ms: pp. 402 *c* 5-408 *b* 25; Mhs: pp. 490 *b* 21-492 *c* 17) [1].

3. History of the patriarchs (series of teachers) (S: —; Dh: — ; M: — ; P: — ; Ms: pp. 408 *b* 26-411 *c* 3; Mhs: pp. 492 *c* 17-493 *a* 19).

4. The council of Vaiśālī (S: pp. 450 *a* 27-456 *b* 8; Dh: pp. 968 *c* 18-971 *c* 2; M: pp. 192 *a* 26-194 *b* 20; P: XII; Ms: pp. 411 *c* 3-414 *b* 11; Mhs p. 493 *a* 25-*c* 11) [2].

1) Cf. J. PRZYLUSKI, *Concile*.

2) Cf. M. HOFINGER, *Étude sur le concile de Vaiśālī* (Bibliothèque du Muséon, vol. 20). Louvain 1946.

5. – THE SOURCES OF THE OLD SKANDHAKA TEXT AND THE EARLIEST BUDDHIST TRADITION.

The above analysis may give in its essentials a correct picture of the contents and structure of the old *Skandhaka* text and of the achievements of its author. The enormous material is clearly divided and arranged according to a well conceived plan, in which connected chapters are knit together into a higher unity. The work begins with the fundamental institutions of the Buddhist monastic life, the admission to the order, the confession ceremony, the retirement during the rainy seasons and the Pravāraṇā ceremony. There follows a discussion of the most important conditions of life, of clothing, food and drugs for the sick. Then the law of the community is treated in detail, above all the punishment proceedings of the community. The conclusion is formed by addenda and by a chapter containing the special regulations for the order of the nuns. The subdivisions are marked out by the stories which introduce the several chapters. Also within the single chapters the larger sections are mostly separated by introductory narratives. The personality of the author stands out prominently in the plan of the work. He has not, as the character of the materials would lead us to expect, a systematic legal mind. His manner of exposition does not issue logically from hard and fast general principles [1]. It is rather an artistic gift. This is shown already by the idea of clothing the whole

[1] A comparison with the quite different structure of the Vinaya of the Mahāsaṃghika is very instructive (cf. the Appendix).

material in the form of a biography of the Buddha. It comes most clearly to light in the manner, in which he cleverly arranges by a tale the passage from a subject to another, even if the second one is not in his proper place in the context according to the principles of a rigid systematism. I recall e.g. the rules on the care of the sick and the distribution of the property of the deceased, which are introduced by the story of the sick monk who is nursed by the Buddha himself (see above p. 101).

As already stated, the proved existence of such a first-class work of the first half of the 4th century B.C. is of the greatest importance and is apt to throw new light on the most different aspects of the earliest Buddhism. We do not need to waste words on its importance for the history of the Vinaya. But it is also of the highest value as a source for the history of Buddhism in general. We may recall e.g. the special regulations issued by the Buddha in the legend of Śroṇa Koṭīkarṇa (see above, p. 90) for the marginal zones of the Buddhist region; they allow us to infer the range of the spread of Buddhism at the time of the composition of the work [1]. The text is an inexhaustible mine for the history of Indian culture, and gives us information on a vast quantity of things out of the current life of that times. We may also mention in passing the value of this work for Indian linguistic history. It has been known for a long time that the earliest Buddhist canon was composed in an archaic language of its own, the traces of which are still recognizable in the extant versions. The researches of S. Lévi were decisive in this

[1] Cf. P. Pelliot, *Deux itinéraires de Chine en Inde à la fin du VIII^e siècle* (in *BEFEO*, IV, 1904, pp. 131-413), pp. 379-381.

connection [1]. Now, the examples quoted by S. Lévi are mostly drawn from the Vinaya. So the old *Skandhaka* text was composed in this dialect. But in this way scholarship is confronted no more with a fluid mass of a tradition, but with a clearly individualized work, the origin and date of which can be determined within narrow limits; and this enables us to employ other methods and to reach much more exact results.

We are not going to discuss here all that. There is, however, a question which I intend to study in some detail: is it possible to find out something about the sources utilized by the author of the *Skandhaka* work? Could we in this way get some information on the nature of the Buddhist tradition in his times?

It would seem obvious, in order to answer the second part of the question, to turn in the first place to the direct evidence offered a bove all by the accounts of the councils at the end of the *Skandhaka* text. I prefer, however, to take the other way and to try first of all to draw some inferences from the nature of the text itself. In this way it is possible to reach more precise results; and besides we gain thereby a scale of comparison for measuring the reliability of the data in the account of the councils.

If we now proceed to investigate the composition of the *Skandhaka* work, there is a preliminary remark which we must keep clear in our mind. Just with the Vinaya rules, which form the bulk of the work, things are particularly unfavourable for finding an answer to our que-

1) S. Lévi, *Observations sur une langue précanonique du Bouddhisme*, in *J. As.*, 1912, II, pp. 495-514.

stion. The old *Skandhaka* work, being a fundamental and comprehensive creation, a novelty in its field, has replaced everything earlier and thus has deprived us of the possibility of direct comparison. Relevant material is only occasionally preserved in the canon, as e.g. the very diffused *Pravāraṇāsūtra* [1], which describes an archaic Pravāraṇā ceremony of the Buddha and his disciples. Nevertheless some elements can be obtained even from the *Skandhaka* work itself; and in the first place I should like to draw attention to the following remark.

In the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka (pp. 866 *c* 5-20) and of the Mahīśāsaka (pp. 147 *c* 29-148 *a* 11) we are told how five monks address themselves to the Buddha with the question, what should serve them as food; he explains to them that they should eat only food obtained as alms in their begging bowl. There follows a list of foodstuffs which they have obtained on their begging trip and of which the Buddha allows them to partake.

In the same way in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka (p. 866 *c* 20-23) the five monks ask which drug they should employ, whereupon the Buddha mentions to them rotten urine (of oxen).

In the *Cīvaravastu* of the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin (p. 194 *b* 7 seq.) and of the Dharmaguptaka (p. 849 *b* 11-16) the five monks ask what clothes they should use, whereupon the Buddha mentions to them picked-up rags. The

[1] *Saṃyuttanikāya*, 8,7 (I, pp. 190 seq.): *Madhyamāgama*, 121 (T 26, p. 610 *a* 8-*c* 21; *Saṃyuktāgama*, 1212 (T 99, p. 330 *a* 4-*c* 19); *Saṃyuktāgama*, 228 (T 100, p. 457 *a* 29-*c* 28); *Ekottarikāgama* 32,5 (T 125, pp. 676 *b* 28-677 *b* 27); *Shou hsin sui ching*, T 61; *Hsin sui ching*, T 62; *Chieh hsia ching*, T 63; A. F. R. HOERNLE, *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature found in Eastern Turkestan*, vol. I, pp. 36-40.

Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka lists on this occasion ten kinds of clothes, which it is allowed to accept.

Lastly in the *Śayanāsanavastu* of the Sarvāstivādin (p. 243 *a* 21-25) and of the Dharmaguptaka (p. 936 *b* 22-*c* 2) the five monks ask where they should live, and the Buddha mentions to them as dwelling places forests, caves, the foot of trees etc.

Who are these five monks, who appear nowhere else in the *Skandhaka* work and play nowhere a great role? The answer is not difficult. The Buddhist tradition knows such a group of five monks; they are the five monks whom the Buddha wins as disciples on his first standing forth as teacher in Benares, and who form his first community. The discourses quoted above take place (with a single exception) [1] all of them in Benares, which city is otherwise very seldom mentioned in the *Skandhaka* work. In every case these are precepts of the most general kind, such as the Buddha would naturally give to his very first disciples. We are justified therefore in seeing in them the five monks of the earliest community.

But the appearence of these five monks in the said passages has something peculiar. They turn up quite isolated and abruptly, nowhere are they introduced, and they disappear with equal suddenness. The questions, which they address to the Buddha, do not fit in their environment. In the frame of the all-covering activity of the Buddha as it is usually described by the *Skandhaka* work, in front of the mass of meetings of the most different sorts and of a community organization developped

[1] The Vinaya of the Sarvastivādin, p. 194 *b* 7 mentions Rājagṛha, but in the parallel version in the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka we have here too Benares.

down to the smallest details, these sparse simple instructions to his earliest disciples are really out of their place. And indeed, they appear as remnants only in some of the versions. More advanced times were no longer interested in them. On the other side their preservation in several versions is in favour of their belonging to the old *Skandhaka* work. But they cannot have been invented by its author, because they are not consistent with the spirit of his work, in which they look as foreign intrusions. Moreover, general instructions of the Buddha to his first disciples should stand together at the beginning of his career, and not dispersed in the account of his later activity.

All this leads to the following conclusion. The passages quoted come from an old account, in which the Buddha gave to his first disciples in Benares the fundamental instructions for the life of a Buddhist monk. This account was known to the author of the *Skandhaka* work and was utilized by him. He inserted the single rules in the chapters of his work in the places where they belonged according to their contents, without regard to the fact that these first instructions to the first disciples did not fit into the account of the later activity of the Buddha.

Thus we come to the result that the author of the *Skandhaka* employed older materials for the composition of his work. The materials used had already some shape. Also the idea of presenting the several rules as words spoken by the Buddha is not his own. Of course the instructions of the Buddha to his first disciples, the remnants of which we have found, were but a modest beginning in front of his grandiose attempt to expound the whole Vinaya in the frame of a biography of the Buddha.

In this way we have gained a first starting point, which makes it possible for us to get a peep into the sources and the working methods of the author of the *Skandhaka*. Now we shall go one step further.

The sections of the *Skandhaka* work dealing with the disciplinary procedure of the community have by their very nature many points in common with the collection of punishable offences in the confession formulae of the Prātimokṣa and with its commentary, the *Vibhaṅga*[1]. Chiefly some legends and legend-like tales show striking similarities with stories in the *Vibhaṅga*; they are above all the stories of Aśvaka and Punarvasuka and of Ariṣṭa in the *Pāṇḍulohitakavastu* (see above pp. 107 and 110), of Dabbo Mallaputto in the *Śamathavastu* (p. 113) and of Devadatta in the *Saṃghabhedavastu* (pp. 116 seqq.). In the case of the stories of Dabbo Mallaputto and Devadatta the situation is troubled through the fault of the tradition, but the essentials are clear.

The Prātimokṣa says of the 8th Saṃghāvaśeṣa offence: If a monk out of hatred accuses another monk to have committed a Pārājika offence, and later confesses that his accusation was baseless, he renders himself guilty of a Saṃghāvaśeṣa offence.

On this the *Vibhaṅga* tells the following story, which appears with the same essential features in all the versions[2]. The monk Dabbo Mallaputto, who had reached arhatship already in his young years, undertakes with the

[1] See the relevant quotations in the translation of T. W. RHYS DAVIDS and H. OLDENBERG, *Sacred Books of the East*, voll. XIII, XVII and XX, Oxford 1881-1885.

[2] Cf. S: pp. 22 *a* 8-23 *a* 25; Dh: pp. 587 *a* 25-588 *b* 26; M: pp. 15 *a* 3-16 *b* 3; P: *Saṃghādisesa*, VIII, 1; Ms: T 1442, pp. 691 *b* 8-697 *c* 5; Mhs: p. 280 *a* 19-*c* 6; only in Mhs the nun is missing and the two monks are themselves

Buddha's approval the task of allotting to the monks living rooms and sleeping couches and of issuing the invitations to meals. The monks Mettiyo and Bhummajako, who believe themselves to be unfairly treated, instigate the nun Mettiyā to spread out that Dabbo Mallaputto has sinned with her. The question comes before the Buddha, who calls upon Dabbo Mallaputto to justify himself; when the latter asserts his innocence, the Master causes the nun Mettiyā to be expelled from the order. The monks Mettiyo and Bhummajako confess themselves as the instigators, and this moves the Buddha to include their offence as the 8th Saṃghāvaśeṣa offence in the Prātimokṣa.

The same tale occurs in the *Śamathavastu* in the *Skandhaka* (see above, p. 116)[1], and in the Vinaya of the Pāli school it even corresponds word for word with the narrative of the *Vibhaṅga*. But this coincidence is illusory and does not allow us to draw further conclusions. We meet here for the first time with a phenomenon which is familiar to everybody who has worked upon the scriptures of the Buddhist canon, and with which we shall meet often later; this is the tendency to mutually complete and adapt the different collections of the holy scriptures. Portions that seemed to be missing in one collection, were taken from another, and connected portions were reduced to the same shape; it is a procedure which of course obliterates the original conditions and renders our researches very difficult. In our case, however, the other versions

the accusators. In Ms the antecedents of Dabbo Mallaputto are narrated in much greater detail.

[1] The same theme serves in the *Kṣudrakavastu* as the base for another story; see above, p. 125.

have preserved the original situation in the *Skandhaka*, or in portions corresponding to the *Skandhaka*[1]. They tell us that the nun Mettiyā accuses the monk Dabbo Mallaputto, that the latter purges himself from suspicion through a solemn declaration, and that the Buddha thereupon causes the nun Mettiyā to be expelled and institutes for similar cases the procedure based on conscience (of the own innocence) (*sativinayo*), according to which the accused solemnly declares his own innocence in front of the assembled community.

The story is here told in another manner. Only the barest necessary is given for explaining the institution of the procedure based on the conscience (of the own innocence). All the rest is left out. Nevertheless the connection of this account with the one in the *Vibhaṅga* is not to be mistaken. It is the same incident which is told here and there, and we are justified to suppose a dependence of the two accounts from each other. The question on which side lies the dependence must be left out of account for the moment.

The element of uncertainty in the Devadatta legend is larger, because of the development which it has undergone. We have already discussed briefly in the foregoing chapter how is the position here. If we assume that the shorter accounts represent the original traditions, we obtain the following picture.

In the Prātimokṣa it is said, concerning the 10th Saṃghāvaśeṣa offence, that a monk who is trying to split the community and inspite of a threefold admonishment is

[1] Cf. on this the remarks made above (p. 113, n. 1). In the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka the nun is not mentioned; it is only said that the monks charge Dabbo Mallaputto with that offence.

not deterred from doing it, becomes guilty of a Saṃghāvaśeṣa offence.

To this the *Vibhaṅga* has to say: Devadatta deliberates with his four most trustworthy followers, how he might split the community; he suggests to ask for a reform of the monastic rules in the sense of greater stringency, because severity impresses on people's mind. The Buddha rejects his proposal, and now he begins agitating in favour of his idea. As after a threefold admonishment he does not give it up, the Buddha declares his action to be a Saṃghāvaśeṣa offence.

The *Skandhaka* on the other side say: Devadatta organizes at a meeting of the monks a voting on his five points and sets up with 500 young and inexpert monks, who take his side, a community of his own. Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana succeed, however, in leading the monks back to the Buddha, and Devadatta dies of blood vomiting.

It seems obvious to assume a connection between the two accounts; that of the *Skandhaka* would represent an amplification, which wants to deny the success of Devadatta and represents his enterprise as a failure [1]. But in the case of a legend so diffused as that of Devadatta a direct dependence is questionable. At least we can say that the amplified form of the Devadatta legend shows peculiarities which go back to the *Vibhaṅga*, like the common begging trip of the disciples of Devadatta, which gives to the Buddha the motive for a prohibition [2]. There exists

[1] In fact, the sect of Devadatta still existed in much later times; see the evidence of Fa-hsien (*Kao sêng Fa hsien chuan*, T 2085, p. 861 *a* 12 seq.).

[2] See above p. 119; to this corresponds S: Pātayantika offence No. 36; Dh: No. 33; M: No. 32; P: No. 32; Ms: No. 36; Mhs: No. 40.

thus a certain likelihood that the author of the *Skandhaka* drew from the tradition of the *Vibhaṅga*.

With the legends of the *Pāṇḍulohitakavastu* we reach more solid ground. In the Prātimokṣa the following is said about the 12th Saṃghāvaśeṣa offence [1]. If a monk leads in some place a scandalous life, which damages the reputation of the community, the monks should expel him from that place. If he does not obey, and if he does not listen to a thrice repeated admonishment, he becomes guilty of a Saṃghāvaśeṣa offence.

On this the *Vibhaṅga* says [2]. In Kīṭāgiri dwell the two monks Aśvaka and Punarvasuka, who lead a licentious life. Some monks happen to pass through that place, hear of it and tell the Buddda. He sends Ānanda (Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana) and causes the Pravâsanīya (Pabbājaniya) proceedings to be carried out against them, in consequence of which they are bound to leave the place. As they do not comply, he declares it to be a Saṃghāvaśeṣa offence [3].

The account of the *Skandhaka* too begins with a description of the bad life of the two monks. Some versions mention also the mission of Ānanda (Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana). This is followed by particulars about the performance of the Pravāsanīya procedure and its possible annulment.

1) S: No. 12; Dh: No. 12; M: No. 13; P: No. 13; Ms: No. 12; Mhs: No. 13.

2) S: pp. 26 *b* 9-27 *b* 6; Dh: pp. 596 *c* 17-598 *b* 8; M: pp. 21 *c* 11-22 *c* 2; P: *Saṃghādisesa*, XIII, 1; Ms: T 1442, pp. 705 *a* 5-707 *a* 1; Mhs: p. 286 *c* 16-289 *a* 23.

3) In some versions the narrative and the account of the proceedings against the two monks are enlarged upon. The differences in the Vinaya of the Mahāsaṃghika are even larger. In them it is the group of six monks whose life causes scandal, and the layman of Kīṭāgiri complain of it to the Buddha.

The kinship of these two tales is not to be denied. In most versions the *Skandhaka* faithfully reproduce the beginning of the narrative of the *Vibhaṅga*. The Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika simply refers the reader to it. Only the account in the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin shows greater independence. But here too a parallel account in the *Kṣudrakavastu* (p. 290 *a* 1 - *c* 15) contains the particulars that are missing in the *Pāṇḍulohitakavastu*. This agreement of the texts belongs to the several versions and therefore is due, as we have it, to a later process of unification. But the fact remains that both accounts concern the same facts and that these are told mostly in the same manner.

This connection becomes even clearer if we compare the *Aśvakasūtra* of the *Madhyamāgama* [1], in which too the monks Aśvaka and Punarvasuka are on the scene. This text tells us that the two monks do not observe the meal times settled by the Buddha. Other monks inform the Buddha and he summons them, reproaches them and gives them instruction. We have here the same persons, and they equally trespass against the Buddhist rules of life. But the resemblance is merely a superficial one. And the kinship between the two Vinaya accounts appears even the more striking in comparison.

Similar is the case of the second tale of the *Pāṇḍulohitakavastu*, concerning the monk Ariṣṭa. About the 55th Pātayantika offence [2] the Prātimokṣa has to say: If a monk upholds the opinion, that the so-called hindering elements (*antarāyikā dharmāḥ*) do not form an obstacle for those who abandon themselves to them, he should be

[1] *Chung a han*, 195 *Kiṭāgirisuttanta*, *Majjhimanikāya*, 70.
[2] S: No. 55; Dh: No. 68; M: No. 48; P: No. 68; Ms: No. 55; Mhs: No. 45.

instructed and corrected by the other monks. If inspite of a thrice repeated admonishment he does not give up his opinion, he becomes guilty of a Pātayantika offence.

On this the *Vibhaṅga* has to say [1]: The monk Ariṣṭa holds the opinion that the hindering elements do not imply any obstacle on the path of Release for the man who abandons himself to them. Other monks try to instruct him, and since he does not listen to them they inform the Buddha. The latter speaks personally with Ariṣṭa and also causes him to be thrice admonished by the community. As everything is useless, he declares him guilty of a Pātayantika offence and causes a regulation to this effect to be inserted in the Prātimokṣa [2].

According to the account of the *Skandhaka* Ariṣṭa holds also the erroneous opinion that the hindering elements do not represent an obstacle on the path of Release. The other monks, who vainly try to convince him, turn to the Buddha. The latter speaks with him, causes him to be thrice admonished by the community, and since all this remains fruitless, has the Utkṣepaṇīya procedure performed against him, excluding him thus from the community.

These two accounts show the closest mutual connection and in this case too the beginning of the narrative in the *Skandhaka* in most versions agrees word for word with the *Vibhaṅga*. Only the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin and of the Mūlasarvāstivādin give short independent accounts. Here too we find a parallel in a Sūtra, viz. the *Ari-*

[1] S: p. 106 *a* 3-*b* 8; Dh: p. 682 *a* 9-*c* 16; M: pp. 56 *c* 12-57 *b* 1; P: Pācittiya LXVIII; Ms: T 1442, pp. 840 *b* 20-841 *a* 18; Mhs: p. 367 *a* 3-*b* 21.

[2] The various versions show the usual oscillations in describing the proceedings against Ariṣṭa. Some mention also the Utkṣepaṇīya procedure, which really is in its right place in the *Skandhaka* only. The Vinaya of the Mahīśāsaka speaks even of an attempt at mediation by Śāriputra.

ṣṭasūtra of the Madhyamāgama [1]. According to this text Ariṣṭa upholds the same wrong doctrine, is advised in vain by the monks and is eventually summoned before the Buddha, who admonishes him and adds to this a general instruction. The agreement here is rather far-reaching. But the close relationship of the two accounts in the Vinaya is not affected thereby.

Thus we see that in several cases a story in the *Skandhaka* agrees with a story in the *Vibhaṅga*, and this in such a way, that there is no doubt about a dependence. There remains the question, on which side is the dependence. A reply to this question is made more difficult by the secondary levelling tendency, which is again and again observed in these texts. Even the greater or smaller length of a story is no proof, since an abridgement of the original is as well admissible as an amplification. But the following remark may help us. It is a recognized fact that the Prātimokṣa belongs to the oldest components of the sacred canon of Buddhism. A far-reaching agreement of the various versions shows that its text was fixed at an early date, and already the *Vibhaṅga* contains remnants of most ancient explanations. Now, it is characteristic of the Prātimokṣa that its regulations extend down to particulars. This is not so much due to a desire for precision, but shows on the contrary an incapacity to grasp the general principles beyond the particular case. A good instance is the Prātimokṣa precept treated in the last place above. This rule of course does not imply that only the opinion that the hindering elements do not form an obstacle on the path of Release is an offence. Naturally

[1] *Chung a-han*, 200 = *Alagaddūpamasutta*, *Majjhimanikāya*, 22.

the same goes for all other heretical opinions. But the text sticks to the heresy which by chance gave origin to the rule, and mentions it alone. Hereby we find a possibility to answer the question put above. The story of the monk Ariṣṭa, who upholds the opinion that the hindering elements do not represent an obstacle on the path to Release, belongs to the Prātimokṣa and is intended to illustrate the relevant Prātimokṣa rule. On the other side it is wholly improbable that the author of the *Skandhaka*, when he had to mention an heretic opinion as motive for the Utkṣepaṇīya procedure, should hit, without a model and out of hundred possibilities, just upon this opinion. He has therefore taken the story of Ariṣṭa from the commentary to the Prātimokṣa. And what is valid for one story, is of course valid for the others too.

We come thus to the result, that the author of the *Skandhaka* knew, if not already the *Vibhaṅga*, at least similar explanations to the Prātimokṣa, and that he drew some of his stories from them. With this we have secured another source of the old *Skandhaka* work. But once again we can go beyond this.

For most of the legends in the *Skandhaka* work we are lacking other old sources, and thus we have no possibility to ascertain their origin and to decide whether they are inventions of the author or come from an earlier tradition. But some legends contain also sūtra-like sections, and the case with them is different, because they often find correspondences in the Sūtrapiṭaka. I choose as an example for this the legend of Śrona Koṭiviṃśa in the *Carmavastu* (see above, p. 89). In this legend, after the antecedents and the admission of Śroṇa to the order we find the following report.

In spite of every effort, Śroṇa cannot succeed in obtaining Arhatship; eventually he loses courage and thinks of quitting the order and returning to worldly life. The Buddha hears of this and instructs him. He asks Śroṇa, who as layman had been a good lute player, whether he could play when the strings were too tightly strung. Śroṇa replies in the negative. In the same way he negativates the question whether he could play when the strings were too lax. They must have just the right moderate tension. And now the Buddha teaches him. The monk too should not stretch his mental powers too much or too little, but must keep to the right middle path; then he will reach his goal. Śroṇa, takes to heart this advice and reaches in a short time Arhatship (S: — ; Dh: p. 844 *b* 7-*c* 7; M: p. 146 *a* 23-*b* 8; P: V, 1, 12-18; Ms: T 1450, p. 186 *a* 21-*c* 3; Mhs: p. 481 *c* 9-25).

In several versions the following narrative is added. The disciples, who have obtained Arhatship, are accustomed to go to the Buddha and to communicate to him the knowledge they have obtained, in order to get his confirmation and thus to be certain of their success. Śroṇa too does so and speaks of the six things, to which an Arhat should wholly dedicate himself. The Buddha approves his words and praises him before the assembled disciples (S: — ; Dh: pp. 844 *c* 7-845 *a* 15; M: — ; P: V, 1, 19-28; Ms: pp. 186 *c* 3-187 *b* 4; Mhs: —).

These sections contain both of them instructions like those we usually find in the Sutra; and indeed they can be found also in the Sutrapiṭaka. In *Madhyamāgama*, 123, *Saṃyuktāgama*, 254 and *Aṅguttaranikāya*, VI, 55 both sections are united into a Sutra. In *Ekottarikāgama*, 23, 3 we find the first section alone as an independent Sutra.

From all this the question derives, how this double tradition is to be explained. Are the texts of the Sūtrapiṭaka drawn from the Vinaya, or has the latter taken them from the Sūtrapiṭaka?

Happily we find here too some cases, which make it possible for us to reach a decision. The *Poṣadhasthāpanavastu* (see above p. 111) begins with a story, in which it is told how the Buddha at a Poṣadha ceremony refuses to recite the Prātimokṣa because an unworthy monk is present, how Maudgalyāyana discovers this monk and removes him from the assembly, and how the Buddha thereupon delivers a sermon in which he compares 8 marvellous qualities of the sea with 8 marvellous qualities of his doctrine. This section is found in all versions and belongs therefore to the old *Skandhaka* work [1]. The sermon on the 8 qualities of the sea and of the doctrine shows a marked sūtra-character; and indeed it is found in the Sūtrapiṭaka, in *Madhyamāgama*, 37 and in *Aṅguttaranikāya*, VIII, 20. If we ask from which side the borrowing took place, we are led in this case to suppose that the text originally belonged to the Vinaya, because also the Sūtra texts quoted above contain the same introductory narrative, which has a meaning and a purpose in the Vinaya only. The tendency towards adaptation and completion, of which we have already spoken, has apparently contributed to have it taken over into the Sūtrapiṭaka. But there is one peculiarity. Immediately near the said two Sūtra there is a second text, which also contains the ser-

[1] The Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin is content with a simple reference to the *Madhyamāgama*. The Vinaya of the Mahāsaṃghika too has only the beginning of the story, and then gives merely the reference. Both the proceedings are tantamount to a complete reproduction of the text in this place.

mon of the 8 marvellous qualities of the sea and of the doctrine and shows merely a different padding: the *Asurasūtra* (*Madhyamāgama*, 35 and *Aṅguttaranikāya*, VIII, 19; also *Ekottarikāgama*, 42, 4). It narrates how the prince of the Asuras Pahārādo comes to the Buddha and is interrogated by him on the 8 marvellous qualities of the sea, whereupon the Buddha in his turn speaks about 8 marvellous qualities of his doctrine. Notwithstanding the difference of the surroundings, the agreement with the text of the *Poṣadhasthāpanavastu* is so great, that a connection cannot be rejected. How are we to conceive the relationship in this case?

Here the possibility of a decision is given by the fact that this is not simply a borrowing, but a recasting of the text. This speaks in favour of a borrowing by the author of the *Skandhaka*. A recasting would be superfluous in the case of a borrowing from the Vinaya into the Sutrapiṭaka. And indeed, as we have seen above, a borrowing of the Vinaya text without change has taken place, and it is wholly impossible that the same text should be recast also into the *Asurasūtra*. Things would have been different if the author of the *Skandhaka* had wished to employ for his work the sermon of the 8 marvellous qualities of the sea and of the teaching. He could not utilize the story of the Asura prince Pahārādo, but had to create a frame-story corresponding to the plan of his work. And therefore it was he who borrowed and recast the text. This is again corroborated by a particular, which he overlooked while re-creating the text. In the *Asurasūtra* the Buddha inquires about the 8 qualities, because of which Asuras like the sea. This passage, which has a meaning only in a conversation with the prince of the Asuras, has

remained unchanged in the Vinaya. Of four versions containing this portion of the text, three have preserved it [1]. This clinches the argument. Things stand as follows. The oldest text is the *Asurasūtra*. This was known to the author of the *Skandhaka* and he utilized it for his work, by enclosing it in another frame work. Later, as a result of the above mentioned tendency to levelling and completing, its recast was taken once more into the Sutrapiṭaka, where it came to rest side to side with the original Sutra. Thus we arrive to the further consequence, that the author of the *Skandhaka* work employed also Sūtra, which he, when necessary, modified for his own purposes.

Our researches on the *Skandhaka* work itself lead to the following results, if we sum up all that we have said above. The author had a rich and varied material available for his work. Firstly, collections of the monastic rules were already extant. This is no wonder, because a gigantic work like this is not created suddenly out of nothing. This material was already shaped into form and was, at least partly, enclosed into the frame of an instruction by the Buddha to his earliest disciples. He had also available narratives elucidating the Prātimokṣa, like those in the extant *Vibhaṅga*. Moreover, he could also draw from a rich Sūtra tradition; he utilized Sūtra which can be found in the extant canonical collections.

Now we can proceed to collect the direct evidence, contained in the *Skandhaka* work, about the Buddhist tradition of that period. In the first place we must mention the legend of Śroṇa Koṭikarṇa, which stands in the *Carmavastu* (see above p. 90) and contains a most impor-

1) Dh: pp. 824 b 10 seqq.; M: p. 161 a 15 seq.; P: IX, 1, 3.

tant piece of information [1]. We are told that the Buddha causes a couch to be prepared for Śroṇa Koṭikarṇa in his own cell, when the latter comes to visit him at Śrāvastī. In the course of the night he invites him to recite the Teaching. Śroṇa obeys and recites a sacred text; the Buddha is satisfied and praises his recitation. This passage is included in all the versions, and belongs therefore to the old core of the *Skandhaka* work. Besides, all versions give also the name of the text recited by Śroṇa Koṭikarṇa, and all of them, with only one exception, call it the *Arthavargīyāṇi Sūtrāṇi* of the Kṣudraka (T 198 = *Suttanipāta Aṭṭhakavagga*) [2].

This piece of evidence means, that at the time of the composition of the *Skandhaka* the *Arthavargīyāṇi Sūtrāṇi* already existed and were a popular sacred text. This is quite credible after the results hitherto obtained. But we can infer something more from it. We notice that in that period a learned monk was supposed by everybody to know sacred texts handed down in a fixed tradition and was required to be able to recite them in the proper way. In other words, there must have existed a well regulated system of transmission, in which the sacred texts were taught and learnt. The mention here and in other old works chiefly of metrical texts [3] is to be explained by

1) Discussed in a brilliant essay by S. Lévi, *Sur la récitation primitive des textes bouddhiques*, in *J. As.*, 1915, I, pp. 401-447.

2) Dh: p. 845 c 22 *shih lu chü i*; M: p. 144 b 17 *shih lu i p'in ching*; P: *Mahāvagga*, V, 13, 9 *sabbān' eva aṭṭhakavaggikāni*; Ms: *Divyāvadāna*, p. 20, 24, *arthavargīyāṇi sūtrāṇi*; Mhs: p. 416 a 3 *pa po-ch'i ching*. The Sarvāstivādin mention on p. 181 b 24 f. *po-lo-yen sa-chih-t'o-shih su-tu-lu* (Pārāyaṇa and *Satyadarśa Sūtra*). The Mūlasarvāstivādin mention besides the *Arthavargīyāṇi Sūtrāṇi* a quantity of other texts (cf. S. Lévi, op. cit., pp. 412 seqq.).

3) On other texts attested at an early period cf. S. Lévi, op. cit., pp. 417 seqq.

the fact that metrical texts were the first to be handed down in a fixed form, while for the texts in prose a more free form of transmission was allowed for a longer period [1].

Now we shall turn to the accounts of the councils and see what we can glean from them. The account of the first council in Rājagṛha is preserved in all versions; it belongs to the old core of the *Skandhaka* work and in our opinion is an invention of the author of the *Skandhaka*. It relates the compilation of the canon of the sacred scriptures immediately after the death of the Buddha. This implies the existence of such a canon, because even if it is an invention, such an invention is possible only if at the time of its rise a canon was extant, of which it was desired to explain the formation. Another important fact is that this account gives sufficiently exact informations on the contents of the canon. But here the difficulties begin. These informations are different in each version, and correspond each time to the canon of the school concerned. This means that every school has inserted in the old account data which agreed with its own canon. This can be easily understood. It was an attempt to make it clear that the own canon was the same as that compiled on the first council. But it derives hence that these data are late and useless for our purpose. The only thing which interests us is to know what stood in the old *Skandhaka* work. But there is practically no chance of ascertaining it, because of the manipulations which the tradition has undergone in all the versions. We can only ascertain with a sufficient degree of certitude which of the canonical collections were

1) On this see the Appendix.

mentioned in the old account. And with this we must be content.

In the first place we can say that the Abhidharma was missing. It is not mentioned in the accounts of the Mahīśāsaka and of the Pāli school. Even with the Mahāsāṃghika it is missing in the account proper and is merely mentioned in passing at the end, before the list of teachers [1]. It cannot be assumed that it was omitted from the account at a later date, since the Pāli school and the Mahāsāṃghika and probably also the Mahīśāsaka possessed an Abhidharma. Its omission in the account of the council is therefore a remnant of the old tradition. Besides, in the various versions of the *Skandhaka* work we find again and again passages, which speak only of Dharma and Vinaya [2]. This too is apparently a sign of the old situation. We may therefore conclude that the author of the *Skandhaka* work did not know the Abhidharma. This is not surprising, on account of the late character of that collection. In fact, the Abhidharma works of the various schools, as far as they are extant, are so widely different from each other, that they cannot go back to a common origin, and thus must have come into being only after the split of the schools.

How are things with the much more important Sūtrapiṭaka? Was it mentioned in the old account of the council? This is not at all obvious. The *Skandhaka* is a pure Vinaya work and it is therefore possible that it treated only of

1) T 1425, p. 492 c 18.

2) Cf. H. Oldenberg, *The Vinaya Piṭaka*, vol. I, pp. x seqq.; cf. also M. Hofinger, *Étude sur le concile de Vaiśālī* (Bibliothèque du Muséon, vol. 20), Louvain 1946, pp. 229 seqq.; and the criticism of P. Demiéville, *À propos du concile de Vaiśālī*, in *T'oung Pao*, XL, 1951, p. 253, n. 5.

the compilation of the Vinaya [1]. In this case, however, the unanimity of the tradition seems to be in favour of the mention of the Sūtrapiṭaka. But above any other element, the role played by Ānanda in the account of the council seems to me decisive. His rejection in a first moment, his obtaining arhatship and the accusations levelled against him by Mahākāśyapa occupy a large portion of the account. But this elaborate introduction of his person implies that a particular task was assigned to him at the council. One does not occupy himself in great detail with a secondary person, which has nothing to do and soon disappears again. Now the task of Ānanda at the council is the recitation of the Sūtrapiṭaka. It is an unanimous tradition that Upāli recited the Vinaya, Ānanda the Sūtra. And thus the person of Ānanda proves the presence of the Sūtrapiṭaka in the old account of the council.

So we come to the result that according to the narrative in the old *Skandhaka* work, at the first council under Mahākāśyapa a canon was compiled, which included Vinayapiṭaka and Sūtrapiṭaka, and thus we may conclude that at the time of the composition of this work such a canon was extant. It may be that it was not yet well settled, that it was later subjected to various revisions and amplifications [2]. But its existence cannot be doubted.

[1] In fact, in the case of the second council the tradition of the Pāli school speaks only of a Vinayasaṃgīti (*Cullavagga*, XII, 2, 9); the same does, only in more detail, the Vinaya of the Mahāsaṃghika (T 1425, p. 493 b 22 seqq.).

[2] An interesting piece of evidence is found in *Mahāvagga*, III, 5, 9; The monks are permitted to leave temporarily the retirement of the rainy season, when a householder calls them in order to communicate a Sūtra, which otherwise would threaten to be lost. This rule apparently applies to

This is what we can glean from the accounts of the councils. It is very little, but it happily completes the results hitherto obtained. It entitles us to the conclusion that the various texts, the use of which by the author of the *Skandhaka* we have ascertained, belonged to fixed canonical collections. And this in its turn makes it possible to gain a general picture of the contents of these collections.

Thus we can consider the question put at the beginning of this chapter as answered; we shall now try to give a short final summary of all our results. They give the following picture.

At the time of the compilation of the old *Skandhaka* work about 100 years after the Nirvāṇa the Buddhist tradition had already reached an advanced stage of development. A collection of the sacred scriptures, including Dharma and Vinaya, was already in existence. The Vinaya included the Prātimokṣa, narratives of the type of the *Vibhaṅga* and much material on the monastic rules, which the Buddha was said to have communicated to his disciples. The collection of the Sūtra, which existed on its side, was handed down by a regular machinery of transmission, and we can ascertain a number of texts which belonged to it already in that period.

On this basis the author of the *Skandhaka* created his work. In doing so he was inspired by the model of the Vedic collections, which he wished to confront with something of equal standing. He gathered the whole material on the Buddhist monastic rules into a great well-planned unity. Above all, he gave it a solid cohesion, by fitting

a period in which the collection of the Sūtra was not yet concluded. At the same time it shows how the most different circles contributed to the collection.

it into the frame of a biography of the Buddha. He began with the life of the Buddha till his illumination and the gaining of the first disciples. Then he told step by step how the Buddha was induced to give to the monks the precepts which form the monastic rules. The bulkiness of the material limited him in many long passages to dry enumerations. In the intervals he tried again and again to subdivide and to enliven the whole through lengthy tales and inserted legends. At the end he narrated the death of the Buddha and the compilation of the sacred texts on a first council. A list of teachers was intended to witness the validity of the tradition and the credibility of the text. In his work he utilized everything out of the ancient tradition that appeared to him serviceable. He employed stories from the commentaries to the Prātimokṣa and included some Sūtra texts, which he modified according to his needs. Above everything there stands his own accomplishment and his great, almost artistic power of formation. And thus he created a work which looks imposing, if we imagine it in its original shape, and which hardly found a match in his times: the first great literary work of Buddhism.

With this our main research is at an end. We have reached the goal set at the beginning by ascertaining the original form of the *Skandhaka* and by gaining an insight into the sources and the compilation of the work. In the way of conclusion I would like to discuss briefly two items to which a particular interest is attached, i.e. the biography of the Buddha included in the *Skandhaka* work and the beginnings of the Buddhist church history, which are also connected herewith.

6. – The biography of the Buddha and the beginnings of the Buddhist church history.

The biography of the Buddha, which forms the frame of the old *Skandhaka* work, elicits a particular interest. The greater part of what we believe to know of the life of the Buddha, goes back to it. As we have seen above, not only the most famous later biographies, like the *Nidānakathā* or the *Lalitavistara*, are derived from it, but also early texts like the *Catuṣpariṣatsūtra* or the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* originally belonged to it. The more important becomes thus the question, how we are to consider it, whether it is to be looked upon as ancient tradition or as creation of the author of the *Skandhaka*. Of course this question cannot be fully dealt with within the limits of the present essay. I shall limit myself, therefore, to show by an example the direction in which a solution is to be looked for. For this purpose I choose a section of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* [1], on which detailed studies are now available, viz. the events that took place at the Cāpāla-Caitya near Vaiśālī during the last

[1] In my study I shall take into account only the texts of the canonical collections, because the use of texts whose origin and value we cannot ascertain is only a source of confusion. Of these canonical texts, the Sanskrit version edited by E. Waldschmidt (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, 1950, No. 2-3) reproduces the tradition of the Sarvāstivādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin, which seem to have differed only in minor details. We possess, beside, the text of the Dharmaguptaka in the Chinese *Ch'ang a-han* (T I) and the text of the Pāli school (*Dīghanikāya*, XVI).

journey of the Buddha [1]. Its contents are about as follows [2].

During his stay at the Cāpāla shrine the Buddha talks with Ānanda of the beauty of Vaiśālī and remarks that the man who is master of the 4 parts of the miraculous power (*ṛddhipāda*) can prolong his life till the end of a world age. In spite of a threefold repetition, Ānanda does not understand the hint and remains silent. Māra, the tempter, approaches the Buddha and invites him to enter Nirvāṇa. He had done so already immediately after the illumination, but at that time the Buddha had declared that he would not enter Nirvāṇa before he had proclaimed the Teaching and assured its continuation by founding a community. Māra reminds him of that word and points out that the condition is now fulfilled. Thereupon the Buddha declares that in three months' time he would enter Nirvāṇa, and he gives up his living force (*jīvitasaṃskāra*). A terrible earthquake accompanies this event. Ānanda, who feels the earthquake with great wondering, accosts the Buddha and inquires about the reason. The Buddha enumerates in detail the eight motives of an earthquake. Now Ānanda recognizes his mistake and begs the Buddha to prolong his life till the end of

1) This text has been treated in detail by E. Windisch in his essay *Māra und Buddha* (Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Classe der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, XV/4, Leipzig 1895); the different versions of the *Bhūmicālasūtra* have been thoroughly discussed by J. Przyluski, *Le Parinirvāṇa et les funérailles du Buddha* (Extrait du *J. As.*, 1918-1920, Paris 1920); it has also been touched upon by E. Waldschmidt in his analysis of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (*Die Ueberlieferung vom Lebensende des Buddha*, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, phil.-hist. Klasse. Dritte Folge, No. 29-30, Göttingen 1944-1948).

2) S and Ms: in Waldschmidt 15,1-18,9; Dh: T 1, pp. 15 *b* 16-17 *b* 17; P: *Dīghanikāya*, XVI, 3, 1-48.

the world age. But the Buddha refuses; now it is too late, and he cannot take back his given word [1].

In this text a particular attention is deserved by the sermon of the Buddha on the causes of earthquake, because it has been handed down also elsewhere. Besides the above quoted passage of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, we find it also in the *Aṅguttaranikāya*, VIII, 70 (vol. IV, pp. 308-313) and in the *Ekottarikāgama*, 42, 5 (T 125, pp. 753 *c* 11-754 *a* 11). In these texts eight causes of an earthquake are everywhere listed. There is, besides, also another sermon of the Buddha, in which he speaks of three causes of an earthquake. This is found in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* of the Mūlasarvāstivādin 22,1-23,8 and in the *Madhyamāgama*, 36 (T 26, pp. 477 *b* 21-478 *b* 12). And thus we stand before the question, how these numerous parallel texts are to be explained.

The parallel existence of similar texts is not difficult to explain. At the side of the sermon on the eight causes of an earthquake in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, we have a similar sermon in the Sūtrapiṭaka [2]. And in the same way at the side of the sermon on the three causes of an earthquake in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* we find a similar sermon in the Sūtrapiṭaka. This is due, however, to the often mentioned levelling and completing tendency. The texts, which seemed to be missing in the one Piṭaka, were transferred from the other Piṭaka. In this case it is easy to ascertain in which direction the transfer took place.

1) I do not go into further details, chiefly into the additions in the Pāli version, which are without importance for our purpose.

2) Its presence in the *Aṅguttaranikāya* and the *Ekottarikāgama* does not imply a parallel existence, because it is included in the same collection of different schools.

The sermon on the eight causes of an earthquake in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* is attested by all versions and is firmly knit together with the action of the narrative. It belongs therefore originally to the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* and in the Sūtrapiṭaka it represents a secondary borrowing. A trace of it still appears also in the *Aṅguttaranikāya*, where the whole antecedents have been borrowed along with the sermon, although here they are out of place and unjustified. On the other side the sermon on the three causes of an earthquake in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* is attested in only one version, is unconnected with the action and forms a superfluous double of the preceeding sermon on the eight causes. It belonged, therefore, originally to the Sūtrapiṭaka and was transferred from there into the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*. Thus the situation becomes much simpler. We have only to accept at the origin a sermon on the eight causes of an earthquake in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* and a second sermon on the three causes of an earthquake in the Sūtrapiṭaka. It only remains to explain the relationship of these two texts.

Now it is obvious, and it has never been denied, that the sermon of the three causes of an earthquake in the Sūtrapiṭaka is more archaic than the sermon on the eight causes in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*. It mentions, along with the natural causes of an earthquake and the supernatural powers of an ascetic, only the imminent death of a Buddha as a further cause. The sermon in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* on the other side represents every important event in the life of a Buddha as accompanied by an earthquake. The whole narrative in the Sūtrapiṭaka is also much simpler and more archaic. An earthquake happens and the Buddha explains to Ānanda that it por-

tends his imminent death. This is an incident which can quite easily be based on an historical fact. We can suppose without difficulty, that some time before the death of the Buddha there was an earthquake and that he saw in it, on account of his advanced age, an omen of his imminent death. The story in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* is quite different. Here the Buddha gives up his living force out of his own decision and therefore causes the earthquake. He would have had the possibility of living till the end of the cosmic age. It is the intervention of Māra which gives the motive for his decision. This is an advanced stage of the growth of the legend. Thus we come to this conclusion: The *Bhūmicālasūtra* of the Sūtrapiṭaka represents the old tradition. The account in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, on the contrary, is a later modification and development.

But who was responsible for this modification? I think it was the author of the *Skandhaka* work. The way in which an old Sūtra is here manipulated and made serviceable for his aims is exactly the same as we have noticed with the *Asurasūtra* (see above, pp. 147 seqq.). There are also other elements which point towards him. The essential point in the process of modification is that the earthquake is caused by the action of the Buddha and that his death is not simply imminent, but he consciously gives up his living force. This conscious action of the Buddha requires a justification, and this is given by the intervention of Māra. But since the influence of Māra alone cannot determine the action of the Buddha, a further motive is added in the shape of the uncomprehending behaviour of the disciple Ānanda, which dissuades the Buddha from a prolongation of his life. Thus the whole

incident represents an unitary event and foots on a unitary conception, behind which stands a wise and far-seeing shape-giver. Māra upon coming on the scene reminds the Buddha of an earlier talk which he had had with him shortly after his illumination [1]. This reminder has been introduced by somebody who mastered the legend of the Buddha in its entirety and aimed at bringing it into an unitary form. This is the case of the author of the *Skandhaka* work. Besides, we find such references in passages which certainly go back to him. They are therefore characteristic of his method of working. Such a reference stands in the *Pravrajyāvastu*. In the *Catuṣpariṣatsūtra* the Buddha had sent out his disciples and had empowered them to accept monks in the order through the formula of the triple refuge. In the *Pravrajyāvastu* this passage is quoted, whereupon this sort of ordination is abolished and the final regulation is introduced (see above, pp. 73 seq.). The account of the first council is due to the author of the *Skandhaka*, and there too we come across such references. The unseemly expressions of a monk upon hearing the news of the death of the Buddha, related in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* [2] are taken up in the account of the council; they give to Mahākāśyapa the occasion for the convocation of the council [3]. In the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* the Buddha inflicts the Brahmadaṇḍa upon the

[1] Extant in the *Catuṣpariṣatsūtra* of the Mūlasarvāstivādin (in E. Waldschmidt event 4); but the reference in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* of the Dharmaguptaka and of the Pāli school shows that their tradition too must have contained this episode.

[2] S: T 1435, pp. 145 *c* 25-146 *a* 3; Dh: T I, p. 28 *c* 13-16; T 1428, p. 966 *b* 17-21; P: *Dīghanikāya*, XVI, 6, 20; Mbs: *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, 48,9-11; T. 1451, p. 401 *a* 17-21; Mhs: T 1425, p. 490 *a* 14-29.

[3] S: T. 1435, p. 447 *a* 28-*b* 3; Dh: T 1428, p. 966 *c* 13-18; M: T 1421, p. 190 *b* 20-24; P: *Cullavagga*, XI, 1, 1; Ms: —; Mhs: T 1425, p. 490 *a* 21 seq.

monk Chanda [1]. The account of the council narrates the execution of the punishment [2]. We may be, therefore, justified in seeing the hand of the author of the *Skandhaka* work in the reference to the earlier talk of Māra with the Buddha, which creates a link between the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* and the *Catuṣpariṣatsūtra*.

There is another element. One of the essential changes in the sermon on the causes of an earthquake concerns the position of Ānanda [3]. While in the *Bhūmicālasūtra* no fault attaches to him, in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* he is blamed because his foolish behaviour causes the Buddha not to prolong his life till the end of the cosmic age. But this lowering of Ānanda's position is rooted above all in the account of the council and is closely connected with the position occupied there by Mahākāśyapa. In the account of the council Mahākāśyapa plays an outstanding role. He is represented as the recognized head of the community and everything is done according to his instructions. On the contrary Ānanda, whom we would rather expect to be the testamentary executor of the deceased Buddha, is much lowered in status and is deeply humbled by Mahākāśyapa. Both facts are remarkable and both stand in contrast with the rest of the early tradition. In the tradition of the Sūtrapiṭaka Mahākāśyapa is a prominent disciple, but does not specially stand out and is not often mentioned, with the exception of the *Kāśyapasaṃyukta* of the *Saṃyuktāgama* [4]. On the con-

1) Dh: T 1, p. 26 *a* 17-21; P: *Dīghanikāya*, XVI, 6. 4; Ms: *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, 29, 13-15; T 1451, p. 391 *c* 20-25.

2) M: T 1421, p. 192 *a* 5-19; P: *Cullavagga*, XI, 1, 12 and 15.

3) Cf. J. Przyluski, op. cit., pp. 78 seqq.

4) *Saṃyuktāgama*, T 99, No. 1136-1144; T 100, No. 111-119; *Saṃyuttanikāya*, XVI.

trary Ānanda is the closest attendant of the Buddha and in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* he still is his nearest confident [1]. The author of the account of the council, i.e. the author of the *Skandhaka*, has proceeded to a deep reaching modification and revaluation of the tradition concerning the position of Ānanda and Mahākāśyapa. It is thus likely that the lowering of the status of Ānanda connected with the re-creation of the *Bhūmicālasūtra* is also to be attributed to him.

Besides, we have the following to take into account. In the account of the council Mahākāśyapa heaps upon Ānanda a series of reproaches, among which also that through his fault the Buddha has not prolonged his life till the end of the cosmic age [2]. But since this fault of Ānanda, as we have seen, is not an old tradition but was attributed to him only upon the transformation of the *Bhūmicālasūtra*, we are justified in supposing that it is an invention of the same man, who put it on his charge in the account of the council. At the same time this taking up again the fault of Ānanda, already narrated once, represents one of those brackets employed by the author of the *Skandhaka* for knitting into a unity the events related; it is characteristic of his working method. Everything invites to the conclusion that this transformation of the *Bhūmicālasūtra* into an episode of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* is the work of the author of the *Skandhaka*.

We come thus to the result that this section of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, as we have it now, is not to be

1) Aptly pointed out by E. WALDSCHMIDT, *Die Ueberlieferung vom Lebensende des Buddha*, p. 348 seq.

2) S: T 1435, p. 449 *b* 21-28; Dh: T 1428, p. 967 *c* 11-17; M: T 1421, p. 191 *b* 19-25; P: *Cullavagga*, XI, 1, 10; Ms: T 1451, p. 405 *a* 16-19; Mbs: T 1425, p. 492 *a* 24-29.

considered as an old tradition, but as the creation of the author of the *Skandhaka*, who of course employed for it older traditional materials. His working method is clearly recognizable. He deals quite freely with the tradition, gives it another meaning and completes it through inventions of his own. And everything is subordinated to a unitary plan. He inserts the single incidents in the framework of a great narrative, he carefully places them in agreement and joins them the one to the other through quotations. Also the employ of the various persons is well thought of, and the role attributed to them is kept invariable according to a fixed plan.

What we have shown here at the hand of one example, is however valid for the whole *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, nay, for the whole life of the Buddha in the *Skandhaka*. Already the threads issuing from the said episode and running in all directions are sufficient evidence. Wherever else we may start investigating, we come always to the same result. The biography of the Buddha, which forms the framework of the old *Skandhaka* text, is not authentic old tradition, but a legendary tale, the work of the author of the *Skandhaka*.

This gives rise to important inferences. As seen above, this biography is the basis of the most famous later biographies of the Buddha, and authoritative texts such as the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* and the *Catuṣpariṣatsūtra* are drawn from it. But these are the most important sources, upon which we have hitherto based our knowledge of the life of the Buddha. Once we have recognized that they all go back to a legendary tale, which was created only in the 4th century B. C. about one hundred years after the Nirvāṇa, they cease to represent primary sources.

They may in future be utilized only in as far as we can recognize in them borrowings from earlier tradition. What we know and are able to know about the person and the life of the Buddha, is therefore even less than we have hitherto believed; we must prepare ourselves to relegate in the realm of fable many things which were believed to be trustworthy tradition. And yet even this conclusion represents a progress. Above all, the way is open for a scrutiny of the tradition much more detailed and exact than was hitherto possible. Upto now it was the custom to weigh and value the traditional information about the life of the Buddha chiefly according to its credibility. Now we get the possibility of examining and classifying it on the ground of exact research of the sources. The future tasks of scholarly research are about as follows. Firstly we must determine how far the extant information on the life of the Buddha depends on the biography in the old *Skandhaka* work, and how far independent traditions have maintained themselves at its side. Then we must gain a picture as clear as possible of the biography in the *Skandhaka*. This cannot be any more judged on criteria of credibility, which fail in front of a legendary cycle, because even inventions may look quite credible. On the contrary, we must ascertain by careful analyse which part of old tradition has been worked into it by the author. This will be little in comparison to what was hitherto accepted as credible. But what has been ascertained in this way, will be much more exactly determined for age and origin than the information with which we were wont to work hitherto; it will therefore permit a much more exact judgement and valuation. And this is in the last place the only decisive thing in science.

Now some words on the earliest church history of Buddhism. In the most countries in which Buddhism obtained greater importance and developped a rich literature, it produced also historical works of a peculiar character, half religious and half laic. We find examples in Ceylon and South-Eastern Asia as well as in Tibet and Mongolia. The point of departure is as a rule a church history originating from the home country and treating the oldest period. To this the church history of the country concerned is added. In the same way secular historical sources of various kinds are mixed together. These works are highly interesting, because they represent historical sources of the greatest importance inspite of the diversities in their composition and of the unequal value of their component parts.

In the course of our researches we have touched upon two church histories of the home country (see above, pp. 56 seqq.) of the sort that served as starting point for these historical works. We have seen that they are connected with and issued from the framework narrative of the old *Skandhaka* text. The question arises, whether this result gives us the possibility of gaining a more precise idea of the value of these works as historical sources. This question will be briefly answered here [1].

The two works mentioned above are the church history of the Sarvāstivādin, which was included in the *Aśokarājasūtra*, and the church history of the Pāli school, which is contained in the Singhalese chronicles. Both show, as already explained, approximately the following struc-

[1] On the earliest history of the patriarchs see M. HOFINGER, *Étude sur le concile de Vaiśālī* (Bibliothèque du Muséon, vol. 20), Louvain 1946, pp. 197 seqq. and the literature there quoted.

ture. At the beginning stands the demise of the Buddha and the account of the council of Rājagṛha. The history of the earliest patriarchs comes next. It is followed by the legend of the own school heads, Upagupta and Tissa, after whom come more patriarchs.

In order to form an opinion about these accounts, we must keep in view the fact, that their starting point is the account of the death of the Buddha and of the first council. This comes from the framework narrative of the *Skandhaka*, since the account of the council is an invention of its author. It follows that the beginnings of these church histories must have come into being later than the old *Skandhaka* work, at a time when its framing narrative was already generally accepted. But this is the middle of the 2nd century after the Nirvāṇa at the earliest. People have begun only very late to fix the tradition on the earliest history of the Buddhist church. This is not surprising. We often exert ourselves to fix a tradition only when it threatens to go lost or is already lost for a great part. And indeed the said works are already attached to legends.

The second point upon which we must turn our attention is the uncommonly long duration of the lives of the earliest patriarchs according to these accounts. The heads of the own schools are attached immediately or through but few intermediaries to the personal disciples of the Buddha. This looks suspicious. And in fact this suspicion turns out to be justified. Let us consider firstly the church history of the Sarvāstivādin. It knows two heads of the school, Madhyāntika for Kaśmīr and Upagupta for Mathurā. Of these, Madhyāntika is immediately connected as pupil with Ānanda, Upagupta is so through Śānavāsa.

In the case of Madhyāntika this cannot possibly be true. We have about him another tradition in the church history of the Pāli school, and there he appears among the missionaries who were sent out under Aśoka [1]. Thus in the case of Madhyāntika, the apostle and the head of the Sarvāstivādin school of Kaśmīr, there are two opposite traditions, which contradict and exclude each other. The one makes him a pupil of Ānanda and shifts the mission to Kaśmīr to the earliest times of the Buddhist church; the other knows him as one of the missionaries of the times of Aśoka. Of course there is no doubt that the second tradition alone deserves credence. The consequence is that the church history of the Sarvāstivādin is in this case unhistorical. It has arbitrarily shifted the legend of Madhyāntika and of the conversion of Kaśmīr to the earliest period of the Buddhist church, either because its author lacked precise information about the origin of Madhyāntika, or because he intentionally suppressed it and made him a pupil of Ānanda, in order to secure for him the precedence above the local saint of Mathurā.

How is the situation with Upagupta and Śāṇavāsa? The church history makes of Śāṇavāsa too a pupil of Ānanda. Can we give it credence? Happily here another source comes to our help, the account of the council of Vaiśālī in the *Skandhaka*. Here among the leading elders of the community of that time we meet one Sambhūto Sāṇavāsī, who dwells on the mount Ahogaṅga [2] and whose identity with the patriarch of Mathurā cannot be doubted. When we hear that a personal pupil of Ānanda takes part

[1] See above, p. 13 seqq.

[2] Dh: p. 970 *b* 4; M: p. 193 *a* 20; P: XII, 1, 8; in S: p. 451 *a* 6 Mathnra is mentioned as dwelling place.

in the council of Vaiśālī 100 or 110 years after the Nirvāṇa, this implies an age of at least one hundred years, which is not very credible. It is a pity that the account of the council does not give us any trustworthy data on this subject. With the aim of bestowing the greatest possible authority upon the elders of the council, in several versions all sort of monks are made into pupils of Ānanda, of Aniruddha and of Upāli. Of course we cannot work with this material. Still, the account contains some data in which a trustworthy tradition seems to have been preserved, and among these I reckon the following. Among the elders, whom the convoker of the council Yaso Kālaṇḍakaputto tries to win over because of their great influence, three stand out and are esteemed above the others: Sambhūto Sāṇavāsī, Revato and Sabbakāmī. The account of how Yaso approaches them in order to win them over, lays great stress on their holiness and great knowledge. And here we find a peculiar fact. Just here, where it would be so obvious to stress pupilhood with a personal disciple of the Buddha, the tradition is halting. In the case of Sambhūto Sāṇavāsī and of Revato the majority of the versions (Dh, M, P) [1] knows nothing of this pupilhood, only for Sabbakāmī it is attested in nearly all versions (S, M, P) [2]. This agrees also with what follows. Yaso turns to Sambhūto Sāṇavāsī and Revato because of their influence; and he turns to them first of all. Then we are told that at that time there lived in Vaiśālī an old monk, the oldest in the whole community, viz. Sabbakāmī, and that Yaso and his helpers deemed it expedient

1) Dh: pp. 970 *b* 4-6 and 969 *c* 2-4; M: p. 193 *a* 20 and 22 seq.; P. XII, 1, 8 and 9; Me and Mhs are irrelevant for this account.

2) S: p. 452 *c* 12-14; M: p. 193 *b* 25-27; P: XII, 2, 4,

to approach him too. The esteem with which Sabbakāmī is surrounded reposes upon his grand age and his rank as the oldest monk in the community. There is therefore a chance that he might still have been a personal pupil of Ānanda. And thus we gain a quite credible picture of the situation. It is possible that at the time of the council of Vaiśālī there still lived a very old monk, who in his young age had been a disciple of Ānanda. But this was a particular case and an exception. The others, Sambhūto Sāṇavāsī and Revato, were energetic and active heads of schools, no decrepit old men. It is impossible to believe that they were disciples of Ānanda. We reach thus the conclusion that Śāṇavāsa in all likelihood was no pupil of Ānanda, but was arbitrarily placed in relation with him by the author of the church history.

In this way we obtain the following result for the church history of the Sarvāstivādin. It came into being at a relatively late period. Its author had no trustworthy information for the earliest times. Therefore he utilized as starting point for his narrative the legends forming the final portion of the framing narrative of the *Skandhaka*, and added to it what he knew about the patriarchs of his school, the oldest of whom he arbitrarily made into a pupil of Ānanda. His account is thus for this part devoid of any historical value.

And now we want to examine the parallel section in the church history of the Pāli school. Here the list of patriarchs is as follows: Upāli, Dāsako, Sonako, Siggavo and Moggaliputto. This means that two other names are inserted between the disciple of the Buddha, Upāli, and the head of the Pāli school, Tisso Moggaliputto and his teacher Siggavo. This causes at first a good impression.

But the period of time that must be filled is much longer, because Tisso Moggaliputto as a contemporary of Aśoka is later than Śāṇavāsa by much more than one hundred years. And indeed a close examination shows that this list is by no means better than that of the Sarvāstivādin. We have no mean to ascertain the origin of the names Dāsako and Sonako [1]. But the following arouses our suspicions. In *Dīpavaṃsa*, IV, vv. 27–46 and V, vv. 76–107 the list of patriarchs is treated at great length, with exact details as to when the several patriarchs were ordained, for how long they were bearers of the tradition, i.e. patriarchs (*vinayapāmokkhaṃkatvā*), and when they entered Nirvāṇa. If we place together the ages of the five above mentioned patriarchs, we obtain the numbers 74, 64, 66, 76 and 80 (86) [2]. These indicate the monastic age, i.e. the years after ordination, as it is always the case in the Vinaya and as we are expressly told here [3]. Since ordination can take place at the age of twenty at the earliest, this would give for each patriarch an age of at least 94, 84, 86, 96 and 100 (106) years. All of them ought to have reached an extraordinarily old age. This is improbable, but not yet impossible. But completely incredible is the following. According to the same text, when Dāsako assumed the rank of patriarch after the death of his teacher, he counted 14 years after ordination, Sonako 22, Siggavo 21 and Moggaliputto 12. They were at this time young monks according to Buddhist ideas [4]; and Dāsako

1) I prefer to abstain from equations based merely on superficial similarity of names.

2) There is no need to concern ourselves with small differences in the tradition.

3) See *Dīpavaṃsa*, V, v. 95.

4) The contrast is very sharp if we compare the old age which all of them are said te have reached.

and Moggaliputto could not even be reckoned among the elders, the Sthavira. We are thus expected to believe that the patriarchs on point of death handed over the task of maintaining the Teaching not to one of the oldest monks, but to junior monks; and this in front of the great stress laid by Buddhism on seniority. Such things may have happened now and then, in the case of exceptionally able and gifted monks, but as a rule it is impossible. It would be banking too much on our credulity. For this peculiarity of the tradition there is but one explanation. It is an attempt to cover a large period of time with few traditional names. With this aim in view it was necessary to make the single persons to patriarchs as early as possible and to attribute to them the longest possible duration of life, as it has happened in the *Dīpavaṃsa*. But from this we can infer that here too we are not confronted with an authentic early tradition. Here too the patriarchs of the own school are attached to the legendary patriarchs of the earliest times, with two more names added on account of the greater interval of time. The list thus formed has as little historical value as the series of patriarchs in the church history of the Sarvāstivādin.

There is one question that remains to be answered. The *Dīpavaṃsa* gives precise dates and supports them by synchronisms with the contemporary kings of Magadha and Ceylon. Is this mere invention? But we cannot discuss this question, because we would quit the ground of the Vinaya, with which alone we are concerned here. All the rest must be reserved for separate research, at the centre of which will stand the Singhalese chronicles.

APPENDIX

Tradition and structure of the extant Vinaya works.

According to unimpeachable information, the sacred scriptures of the Buddhists were for a long time handed down orally and were put into writing only later [1]. Bu-ston in his *C'os-'byuṅ* speaks of such a written redaction after the third council [2]. According to the *Dīpavaṃsa* a redaction was effected in Ceylon under king Vaṭṭagāmani Abhaya in the Ist century B. C. [3] The compilation of the old *Skandhaka* work belongs thus to the period of oral tradition and this has deeply influenced the nature of the extant versions.

What oral tradition was able to accomplish in India, is shown by the instance of the Vedic collections, whose bulky texts were faithfully handed down through the

1) The attempt of F. Weller in *Asia Major*, V, 1930, pp. 160-164, to prove the information in the *Dīpavaṃsa* to be untrustworthy, reposes upon the wrong use of a correct principle. When a piece of information appears in different places in two versions of the same work, we are justified in considering it a later interpolation. But the *Mahāvaṃsa* is not simply another version of the *Dīpavaṃsa*, but a complete re-creation, the author of which sometimes behaves very freely in arranging the materials taken over from the parent work. When it places an item in another place than the *Dīpavaṃsa* does, this proves nothing. Besides, oral transmission was very largely used even after the written redaction of the scriptures had taken place; this is shown by the useful materials gathered by P. Demiéville, *À propos du concile de Vaiśālī*, in *T'oung Pao*, XL, 1951, p. 245, n. 1.

2) *History of Buddhism (Chos hbyuṅ) by Bu-ston*, transl. by E. Obermiller, 2nd part (Materialien zur Kunde des Buddhismus, 19. Heft), Heidelberg 1932, p. 101.

3) *Dīpavaṃsa*, 20, v. 20 seq. = *Mahāvaṃsa*, 33, vv. 100 seq.

centuries. But that was a special case. Something of the sort was possible only where the transmission of the texts was assured by a standing well-regulated tradition system. In most cases conditions were not so favourable. Above all, only in the rarest cases a work may have been taken over as sacred text in a standing tradition chain immediately after its compilation. And before this happened, it was subjected to most serious deformations in an uncertain tradition [1].

Generally speaking we may envisage things as follows. At the beginning there is a time of free transmission, during which the text is rendered in free words from memory. Memorial sentences, mostly couched in the form of verses, probably came early to the help of the memory. This sort of transmission has always been employed with less important texts. I recall, e.g. how the Jainas fixed down by means of memorial sentences the contents of the legends which they inserted in their sermons, but left the execution in detail to the reciter [2]. The passage to an established tradition is marked by the appearance of fixed formulae. These are known to everybody from the Buddhist and Jaina tradition. Wherever a subject of common recurrence is treated, it is couched in the same

1) That texts should be subjected to strongest distortions in their earliest period, is an occurrence which repeats itself under the most different circumstances. The texts of the old Greek poets were fixed, when true editions began to appear in the regular book trade. The most serious and often irreparable corruptions took place before that time.

2) L. Alsdorf calls such texts a collection of key-words as basis for the sermon and characterizes them as "an fixation of the skeleton of the oral tradition, which the reciter then had to cover with flesh" (*Der Kumārapālapratibodha*, Alt-und Neu-Indische Studien herausgegeben vom Seminar für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens an der Hamburgischen Universität, 2, Hamburg 1928, p. 27).

words. Also the descriptions regularly repeated in the Jaina canon belong to this class. This gradually leads to an established tradition, which fixes the text in a certain version. But even such an established tradition is never rigid as with the Vedic texts. Chiefly with the Buddhists we remark even later frequent modifications of redactional nature. To these belong the above discussed levelling tendencies, which led to the uniforming of the verbal expression of similar texts in the various canonical collection, or to the transfer of missing texts from one collection into another. Also the inclusion of later texts, as e.g. the Aśoka legend in the *Saṃyuktāgama*, belongs to the same class. These modifications, however, were hardly left to the arbitrary care of single individuals. In my opinion they were carried out on synods of the communities and thus rendered obligatory for further transmission. The information of the recitation of the sacred scriptures on the later councils may go back to such proceedings [1].

All these forms of oral tradition, the free as well as the half-free and the established ones, carried with themselves alterations and distortions of the most different sorts. This was the case above all with the free transmission. Texts which were handed down in this way and which are preserved in several versions, agree only as far as e.g. the accounts of the same event by different persons. If the free transmission lasted for a longer period, then often a remote resemblance only was left. Another fact, which occurs again and again and has a psychological ground, is the following. Sections, which dealt with important

[1] See my paper on the Buddhist councils in *ZDMG*, 102, 1952, p. 241.

subjects in a clear sequence (I shall call them main sections), remained well preserved. Other sections, which gathered unimportant subjects in a jumbled order (I call them bye-sections), were considerably distorted or disappeared completely from memory [1]. As for the redactional alterations, they cause above all uncertainty on the original composition of the works and are a serious obstacle to research. To all this we may add numerous distortions of the texts, caused by the carelessness of the transmitters. The Buddhist monks who handed down the texts were not always men of outstanding intelligence, whose recital was made after due reflection and recollection. Too often the texts were mechanically memorized and chanted out. This is shown already by the mechanical repetition of the rigid formulae, which are inserted in every occasion as wellcome halting points, whether they fit in the context or not. And thus through the carelessness of the transmitters the meaning of the texts is often wrongly caught and distorted. In the worst cases this can go so far, that we are hardly any more in the condition to recognize the original meaning of a text from the widely diverging traditions of the various versions [2].

There was however one element acting against the numerous distortions, a sort of piety which was chary of

1) Since this fact has a psychological basis, it occurs in very different fields. We can observe it even with metrical texts which are badly transmitted. A good instance is the triple tradition of the Saṃkhya text in the *Mokṣadharma*, which I call the epic basic text of the Saṃkhya. Connected series of verses, which reproduce a complete trend of thought, are well preserved. The insignificant connecting verses are distorted beyond all recovery. Cf. my *Untersuchungen zum Mokṣadharma; die sāṃkhyistischen Texte*, in *WZKM*, 32, 1925, pp. 179 seqq.

2) We may compare e.g. the following sections in the *Pravrajyāvastu*: S: p. 152 *a* 18-*b* 8; Dh: p. 810 *a* 22-*b* 11; P: I, 48; Mbv: pp. 488 *c* 7-489 *b* 28.

arbitrary modifications of the tradition. It could happen that single passages, which still clung to memory, were handed down although their original meaning and connection was lost. People were shy of consciously giving up traditional lore. And thus in some texts we are sometimes confronted with dispersed pieces, which disturb and interrupt the context and cannot be understood in its frame, and yet represent authentic and valuable tradition [1]. This piety in the front of tradition has particularly beneficial effects in the case of redactional manipulations. Even if these were most radical, if old texts were cut up and fitted into new surroundings, the portions of the old text were left in a large measure unchanged; and they often give to scientific research most valuable hints for reconstructing the original situation.

Let us now examine the Vinaya works, which we have taken as the basis of our researches, from the point of view of the nature of their tradition. They show unmistakable signs of a long free transmission, which impressed its characteristic marks upon the variants of the several versions. We find the same subjects couched in quite different words, and even the content is often widely different, so that sometimes only a vague similarity is left. We can further observe the typical preservation of the main sections and the distortion and omission of the bye-sections. The differences which can be led back to redactional alterations, play only a secondary role.

1) In its most extreme form this fact was best observed and described by W. SCHUBRING, *Ācārāṅga-Sūtra, Erster Srutaskandha*, Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, XII, No. 4, Leipzig 1910, pp. 44 seqq., and *Worte Mahāvīras*, Quellen der Religionsgeschichte, vol. 14, Göttingen-Leipzig 1937, pp. 15 seqq.

In spite of these considerable divergences in the several versions, caused by the free transmission, the relationship of the said Vinaya works is unmistakable and their common origin can be recognized at every step. The main sections and inserted legends, preserved in all or most versions, form by far the greater portion of the works. This agreement cannot simply be due to the fact that all the texts deal with the same subject, because it includes also inventions which cannot be based upon anything real [1]. Still less it can be explained by borrowing, because it extends to the very structure of the works, even in cases in which the order of the subjects adopted is not at all self-explanatory [2]. And thus, notwithstanding the great differences caused by the form of the tradition, an origin from a common basic work cannot be denied.

Now we shall proceed to discuss the structure of these works and the nature of their tradition in the several schools.

The Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin.

The Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin (*Shih sung lü*, T 1435) was translated into Chinese in the years 404-405 by Kumā-

1) Such are e.g. the legend of Meṇḍhaka (above p. 96), or the story of the Nāga who becomes a monk (pp. 77).

2) I recall e. g. the legend of Śroṇa Koṭikarṇa (p. 90) which stands everywhere in the *Carmavastu*, although it could be included as well in the *Pravrajyāvastu*, as shown by the example of the Mahāsaṃghika; or the story of the sick monk, who is cured by the Buddha himself (p. 102), a story which one would rather expect in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, and not in the *Cīvaravastu* where it is actually included. In the same way the objection against participation of a monk in the confession ceremony is not treated in the *Poṣadha-*

rajīva, Puṇyatrāta (?) and Dharmaruci. Later this translation was completed by Vimalākṣa [1]. It consists of:

1. *Bhikṣuvibhaṅga* (pp. 1-147)
2. *Skandhaka* (pp. 148-302)
3. *Bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga* (pp. 302-346)
4. A certain number of Appendixes (pp. 346-470).

This Vinaya is the only one, with the exception of the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika, which has inserted the *Skandhaka* between the *Bhikṣuvibhaṅga* and the *Bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*. In this process the accounts of the councils were detached from the *Skandhaka* and confined among the Appendixes (cf. above p. 46) [2]. The *Skandhaka* show the following structure:

Ch'i fa

1. *Shou chü chü chieh fa*	pp. 148 *a* 1-157 *c* 28	:	1. *Pravrajyāvastu*
2. *Pu sa fa*	pp. 158 *a* 1-165 *a* 4		2. *Poṣadhavastu*
3. *Tzŭ tzŭ fa*	pp. 165 *a* 5-173 *a* 28	=	4. *Pravāraṇāvastu*
4. *An chü fa*	pp. 173 *b* 1-178 *a* 13	=	3. *Varṣāvastu*
5. *P'i ko fa*	pp. 178 *a* 14-184 *b* 17	=	5. *Carmavastu*
6. *I yao fa*	pp. 184 *b* 18-194 *b* 3		6. *Bhaiṣajyavastu*
7. *I fa*	pp. 194 *b* 4-206 *b* 26	=	7. *Cīvaravastu*

vastu, but in a special chapter, while the objection against participation in the Pravāraṇā ceremony has its place in the *Pravāraṇāvastu* etc.

[1] Interesting particulars in P. Demiéville, *À propos du concil de Vaiśālī*, in *T'oung Pao*, XL, 1951, pp. 242 ff.

[2] This could happen the more easily, since with the Sarvāstivādin even that portion of the biography of the Buddha, which introduced the *Skandhaka*, had been completely detached. As the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* too had been included in the *Dīrghāgama*, the accounts of the councils were the only remnant of the ancient frame. At this point it could be no more understood what was their purpose in that place, and thus they were no longer considered as belonging to the *Skandhaka*, but were included among the Appendixes.

Pa fa

8. *Chia-chih-na i fa*	pp. 206 *c* 1-214 *a* 15 =	8. *Kaṭhinavastu*
9. *Chü-shih-mi fa*	pp. 214 *a* 16-217 *c* 29	9. *Kośāmbakavastu*
10. *Chan-po fa*	pp. 218 *a* 1-221 *a* 12 =	10. *Karmavastu*
11. *Pan-ch'a-lu-chia fa*	pp. 221 *a* 13-228 *b* 10 =	11. *Pāṇḍulohitakavastu*
12. *Sêng ts'an hui fa*		
a. K'u ch'ieh chieh-mo	pp. 228 *b* 11-236 *c* 9	12. *Pudgalavastu*
b. Shun hsing fa	pp. 236 *c* 10-239 *b* 5	13. *Pārivāsikavastu*
13. *Chih fa*	pp. 239 *b* 6-242 *a* 14 .	14. *Poṣadhasthāpanavastu*
14. *Wo chü fa*	pp. 242 *a* 15-251 *a* 15 =	17. *Śayanāsanavastu*
15. *Chêng shih fa*	pp. 251 *a* 16-256 *b* 23 =	15. *Śamathavastu*

Tsa sung

16. *T'iao-ta shih*	pp. 257 *a* 1-267 *a* 21 =	16. *Saṃghabhedavastu*
17. *Tsa fa*		
a. Tsa fa	pp. 267 *a* 22-290 *c* 20 =	19. *Kṣudrakavastu*
b. Pi-ch'iu-ni fa	pp. 290 *c* 21-298 *a* 25	20. *Bhikṣuṇīvastu*
c. —	pp. 298 *a* 26-302 *c* 8 =	18. *Ācāravastu*

As to the tradition of this Vinaya, its peculiarity is that the bye-sections are for the greater part lost. The state of conservation of the main sections and of the legends is, however, good; in any case not worse than in the other versions. It is also noteworthy that in several instances, and above all in the reproduction of the legends, it shows points of contact with the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin. In my opinion it is a case of secondary adaptation. But the mutual influence of the literature of both schools deserves an accurate investigation in a wider context [1].

[1] Generally speaking, an attempt to write the history of the Buddhist literature had better to begin with these two schools.

The Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka

The Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka (*Ssŭ fen lü*, T 1428) was translated into Chinese in the year 408 by the Kaśmīrī Buddhayaśas and by Chu Fo-nien. It consists of:

1. *Bhikṣuvibhaṅga* (pp. 568-713)
2. *Bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga* (pp. 714-778)
3. *Skandhaka* (pp. 779-971)
4. Two Appendixes (pp. 971-1014)

In this Vinaya the *Skandhaka* show the following structure:

1. *Shou chieh chien-tu*	pp. 779 *a*	1-816 *c*	4	—	1. *Pravrajyāvastu*
2. *Shuo chieh chien-tu*	pp. 816 *c*	5-830 *a*	24	=	2. *Poṣadhavastu*
3. *An chü chien-tu*	pp. 830 *b*	1-835 *c*	11	=	3. *Varṣāvastu*
4. *Tzŭ tzŭ chien tu*	pp. 835 *c*	12-843 *b*	10		4. *Pravāraṇāvastu*
5. *P'i ko chien-tu*	pp. 843 *b*	11-849 *b*	9	=	5. *Carmavastu*
6. *I chien-tu*	pp. 849 *b*	10-866 *b*	23	=	7. *Cīvaravastu*
7. *Yao chien-tu*	pp. 866 *c*	1-877 *c*	4	=	6. *Bhaiṣajyavastu*
8. *Chia-ch'ih-na i chien tu*	pp. 877 *c*	5-879 *b*	22		8. *Kaṭhinavastu*
9. *Chü shan-mi chien-tu*	pp. 879 *b*	23-885 *a*	7	=	9. *Kośāmbakavastu*
10. *Chan-po chien-tu*	pp. 885 *a*	8-889 *a*	12	=	10. *Karmavastu*
11. *Ho chih chien-tu*	pp. 889 *a*	13-896 *b*	24	=	11. *Pāṇḍulohitakavastu*
12. *Jên chien tu*	pp. 896 *b*	25-903 *c*	20		12. *Pudgalavastu*
13. *Fu tsang chien tu*	pp. 904 *a*	1-906 *a*	8		13. *Pārivāsikavastu*
14. *Chih chien-tu*	pp. 906 *a*	9-909 *b*	6	=	14. *Poṣadhasthāpanavastu*
15. *P'o sêng chien-tu*	pp. 909 *b*	7-913 *c*	11	=	16. *Saṃghabhedavastu*
16. *Mieh chêng chien-tu*	pp. 913 *c*	12-922 *c*	5	=	15. *Śamathavastu*
17. *Pi-ch'iu ni chien-tu*	pp. 922 *c*	6-930 *c*	5	=	20. *Bhikṣuṇīvastu*
18. *Fa chien-tu*	pp. 930 *c*	6-936 *b*	17		18. *Ācāravastu*
19. *Fang shih chien-tu*	pp. 936 *b*	18-945 *a*	19		17. *Śayanāsanavastu*
20. *Tsa chien-tu*	pp. 945 *a*	20-966 *a*	11	=	19. *Kṣudrakavastu*

and the accounts of the councils, pp. 966 *a* 12-971 *c* 3.

The Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka is one of the most complete, since the bye-sections too are well preserved.

For the rest it shows the typical alterations and distortions, which are the consequences of free oral transmission. Its major characteristic is its circumstantial manner of exposition. The latter is partly based on a certain verbosity of style. On the other part, whenever the coincidence of several conditions allows several combinations in the rules, this Vinaya goes in all detail into these possibilities. In respect of these external peculiarities it resembles most of all the Vinaya of the Pāli school. For the rest there is no close relationship, rather there are some remarkable elements of agreement with the Vinaya of the Mahīśāsaka. I shall give some instances. Only in the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka and of the Mahīśāsaka the story of the visit of the Buddha to the courtesan Āmrapālī, which anticipates the account of the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*, appears in the *Cīvaravastu* (Dh: pp. 855 c 13-856 c 24; M: pp. 135 a 21-136 a 18), while usually it is found in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* (P: VI, 28-30; Ms: pp. 21 c 14-29 c 17). The Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka and Mahīśāsaka alone include in the *Cīvaravastu* the account of the destruction of the Śākya by Virūḍhaka (Dh: pp. 860 b 21-861 a 18; M: pp. 140 c 26-141 c 16). Only with the Dharmaguptaka and Mahīśāsaka the detailed form of the Devadatta legend is included in the *Vibhaṅga*, while with the Sarvāstivādin, the Mūlasarvāstivādin and the Pāli school it is found in the *Skandhaka* (see above pp. 116 seqq.) etc. A very characteristic case is the following. In the basic work at the beginning of the *Pravāraṇāvastu* the introduction of the *Pravāraṇā* ceremony was justified by the behaviour of a number of monks, who had agreed not to speak with each other during the retirement of the rainy season, in order to avoid disputes. This purpose of the narrative

does not appear to have been expressed very clearly, since both the Dharmaguptaka and the Mahīśāsaka school have preserved the story, but have detached it from the introduction of the Pravāraṇā ceremony. In its stead they have invented another justification, that of the unseemly behaviour by the group of the six monks. And this new justification is found in both Vinaya in the same form (Dh: pp. 835 *c* 13-836 *a* 17 and pp. 836 *a* 17-*b* 14; M: pp. 130 *c* 20-131 *a* 6 and p. 131 *a* 7-*b* 7). Such a common innovation cannot have been introduced independently; it bespeaks a close relationship of the two schools [1].

The Vinaya of the Mahīśāsaka

The Vinaya of the Mahīśāsaka (*Wu fên lü*, T 1421) is based on a manuscript, which the pilgrim Fa-hsien brought back from Ceylon, and which was translated into Chinese in the years 423-424 by the Kaśmīrī Buddhajīva. It consists of:

1. *Bhikṣuvibhaṅga* (pp. 1-77)
2. *Bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga* (pp. 77-101)
3. *Skandhaka* (pp. 101-194)

Appendixes are outwardly lacking, but a short chapter of addenda is included in the *Skandhaka* [2]. The structure of the *Skandhaka* in this Vinaya is as follows.

1. *Shou chieh fa*	pp. 101 *a* 6-121 *a* 26	1. *Pravrajyāvastu*
2. *Po-sa fa*	pp. 121 *b* 1-129 *a* 1	2. *Poṣadhavastu*

[1] Also the Vinaya of the Mahāsaṃghika has proceeded to modifications, but in quite another way (Mhs: p. 451 *a* 7-25 and p. 451 *a* 26-*b* 6).

[2] 18. *T'iao fu fa* (pp. 182 *a* 5-185 *a* 28). This chapter corresponds to the appendix with the same title in the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka, which

3. *An chü fa*	pp. 129 *a* 2-130 *c* 18 =	3. *Varṣāvastu*
4. *Tzŭ tzŭ fa*	pp. 130 *c* 19-133 *c* 20 =	4. *Pravāraṇāvastu*
5. *I fa*	pp. 133 *c* 21-144 *a* 11 =	7. *Cīvaravastu*
6. *P'i ko fa*	pp. 144 *a* 12-147 *a* 25	5. *Carmavastu*
7. *Yao fa*	pp. 147 *b* 1-147 *c* 28 }	= 6. *Bhaiṣajyavastu*
8. *Shih fa*	pp. 147 *c* 29-153 *a* 17 }	
9. *Chia ch'ih-na i fa*	pp. 153 *a* 18-153 *c* 21 =	8. *Kaṭhinavastu*
10. *Mieh chêng fa*	pp. 153 *c* 22-156 *b* 18 =	15. *Śamathavastu*
11. *Chieh-mo fa*		
a.	pp. 156 *b* 19-158 *b* 25 =	12. *Pudgalavastu*
b	pp. 158 *c* 1-161 *a* 13 =	9. *Kośāmbakavastu*
c.	pp. 161 *a* 14-163 *a* 2 =	10. *Karmavastu*
d.	pp. 163 *a* 2-164 *a* 12 =	11. *Pāṇḍulohitakavastu*
12. *P'o sêng fa*	pp. 164 *a* 13-166 *b* 7 =	16. *Saṃghabhedavastu*
13. *Wo chü fa*	pp. 166 *b* 8-169 *a* 23 =	17. *Śayanāsanavastu*
14. *Tsa fa*	pp. 169 *b* 1-176 *c* 23 =	19. *Kṣudrakavastu*
15. *Wei i fa*	pp. 177 *a* 1-180 *c* 17 =	18. *Ācāravastu*
16. *Chih po-sa fa*	pp. 180 *c* 18-181 *b* 4 =	14. *Poṣadhasthāpanavastu*
17. *Pieh chu fa*	pp. 181 *b* 5-182 *a* 4 =	13. *Pārivāsikavastu*
18. *T'iao fu fa*	pp. 182 *a* 5-185 *a* 28	Chapter of addenda
19. *Pi-ch'iu-ni fa*	pp. 185 *b* 1-190 *b* 9 =	20. *Bhikṣuṇīvastu*

and the accounts of the councils pp. 190 *b* 10-194 *b* 21.

Of all the Vinaya works we have studied, the Vinaya of the Mahīśāsaka has the worst tradition. In some passages the extant text is apparently lacunous. I refer for instance to the *Pāṇḍulohitakavastu*, in which only the *tarjanīya* and the *pratisaṃharaṇīya karma* are treated, while the *nigarhaṇīya*, *pravāsanīya* and *utkṣepaṇīya karma* are missing. It is utterly impossible that a normal distortion of tradition should be responsible for the omission of these three important procedures of punishment, whose exposition plainly belongs to the main sections and which in the rest of the text are implied as well known. Here

however is much larger (Dh: *T'iao pu*, pp. 971 *c* 4-990 *b* 7). On this occasion I should like to point out that in these addenda too we find enclosed valuable material, which deserves a thorough investigation. I quote as an instance the following tale: Dh: p. 980 *b* 6-27; M: p. 183 *b* 14-*c* 17; Mhs: p. 470 *b* 6-*c* 20.

we are clearly confronted with a gap in the manuscript on which our text is based[1]. But even without this, the tradition of the text is bad and neglected. The bye-sections are preserved to a great extent, but the wording is short and jerky, the single pieces are put together loosely and without order, and the contents too are often distorted. Nevertheless the work has preserved much that is good and early, and it is to be considered as valuable evidence for the basic work. On its close relationship with the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka we have already spoken.

The Vinaya of the Pāli school

The Vinaya of the Pāli school was brought by the Buddhist missionaries to Ceylon and has been preserved there. It consists of:

1. *Mahāvibhaṅga* (= *Bhikṣuvibhaṅga*)
2. *Bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*
3. *Skandhaka*
4. A collection of addenda, the *Parivāra*.

The *Skandhaka* show the following structure:

Mahāvagga

1. *Mahākkhandhaka*		1. *Pravrajyāvastu*
2. *Uposathakkhandhaka*	=	2. *Poṣadhavastu*
3. *Vassupanāyikakkhandhaka*	=	3. *Varṣāvastu*
4. *Pavāraṇakkhandhaka*	=	4. *Pravāraṇāvastu*

[1] We remark that the corresponding parallels in the *Vibhaṅga* are still extant, both the tale of the monks Aśvaka and Punarvasuka, upon which the *pravāsanīya karma* is imposed (M: pp. 21 c 11-22 c 2), and the tale of the monk Ariṣṭa, on which falls the *utkṣepaṇīya karma* (M: pp. 56 c 12-57 b 1).

5. *Cammakkhandhaka*	=	5. *Carmavastu*
6. *Bhesajjakkhandhaka*	=	6. *Bhaiṣajyavastu*
7. *Kaṭhinakkhandhaka*	=	8. *Kaṭhinavastu*
8. *Cīvarakkhandhaka*	=	7. *Cīvaravastu*
9. *Campeyyakkhandhaka*	=	10. *Karmavastu*
10. *Kosambakkhandhaka*	=	9. *Kośāmbakavastu*

Cullavagga

11. *Kammakkhandhaka*		11. *Pāṇḍulohitakavastu*
12. *Pārivāsikakkhandhaka*	=	13. *Pārivāsikavastu*
13. *Samuccayakkhandhaka*	=	12. *Pudgalavastu*
14. *Samathakkhandhaka*	=	15. *Śamathavastu*
15. *Khuddakavatthukkhandhaka*	=	19. *Kṣudrakavastu*
16. *Senāsanakkhandhaka*	=	17. *Śayanāsanavastu*
17. *Saṃghabhedakkhandhaka*	=	16. *Saṃghabhedavastu*
18. *Vattakkhandhaka*	=	18. *Ācāravastu*
19. *Pātimokkhaṭhapanakkhandhaka*	=	14. *Poṣadhasthāpanavastu*
20. *Bhikkhunīkkhandhaka*	=	20. *Bhikṣuṇīvastu*

and the accounts of the councils.

The Vinaya of the Pāli school belongs to the most complete Vinaya works and is similar in this respect to the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka. Here too the bye-sections are preserved to a great extent. It shows a similar verbosity of the exposition, and the development of the most various possibilities, wherever there is occasion for it, is carried to extremes. But it shows also numerous alterations and distortions and is in this respect not better than the other works. An example which sharply characterizes its nature is given by the *Kaṭhinavastu* (see above p. 102 seq.). The cases in which the claim of a monk on a Kaṭhina robe is considered extinct, are listed with tiresome verbosity. On the other side the description of the Kaṭhina procedure itself is so mutilated, that without comparing the other Vinaya it is impossible to get a clear idea of it.

The old controversy of the superiority of the southern tradition above the northern has in the main lost its meaning, since we have gained a better knowledge of the history of the Buddhist schools. Nevertheless some words will not be amiss at this point. In this connection it is advisable to begin with some general remarks on the Buddhist literature of Ceylon [1].

Concerning the subdivisions of the Buddhist literature of Ceylon, the essential distinction is not that between canonical and non-canonical scriptures, but between local literature and literature of the home country. Both distinctions cover themselves up to a certain point, because the tendence in Ceylon was to include into the canon all the works of the home country, even if originally they did not belong to it. But the distinction between canonical and non-canonical literature does not give expression to the real problem.

The literature of the home country of course was not brought to Ceylon in its entirety by Mahinda and his companions. The first missionaries probably brought along only what represented the barest necessary. The great canonical collections and other literature followed gradually at a later time. How this proceeded, we can see in the case of China. In the first place out of the Vinaya the *Prātimokṣa* and the *Karmavācanā* were translated for the still small communities of China. Then other parts of the Vinaya were translated, and only later there followed the translation of the whole work. In the case of the Sūtrapiṭaka too the Chinese communities were content at

[1] In doing this, I keep in view only the outlines of the development, as they are necessary for an understanding of the Pali Buddhism. All the rest has been left out of account.

first with selections and single Sūtras, till eventually the translation of the whole great canonical collections was undertaken. In a like manner we must imagine things in Ceylon. As has been shown by S. Lévi [1], the connection of Ceylon with the home country over the ports of Bharukaccha and Śūrpāraka remained very lively until the first centuries of our era. And thus we must reckon with a lively intercourse of the Buddhists of Ceylon with those of the parent community during this period. In this way gradually the whole of the canonical scriptures reached Ceylon, along with later works. Such are e.g. the *Milindapañha*, the old portions of which were certainly translated into Pāli in the mother country, and the *Niddesa*, which in its extant form belongs to a period after our era.

This connection with the mother country went to an end after the 2nd century A. D. The intercourse with the western ports languished. This is connected with the decay of Bharukaccha, caused by the opening of new sea communications [2]. Also political changes may have played a role, above all the rise of Śaka rule in Mālava. On the other side the communications with Orissa and the ports at the mouth of the Ganges gained greater importance, above all with Tāmralipti, which in earlier times had remained quite in the background. But thereby the Buddhists of Ceylon gained an easy connection with the country of origin and the holy places of Buddhism, and we may safely assume that communications were very

1) Cf. S. Lévi, *Ptolémée, le Niddesa et la Bṛhatkathā*, in *Études Asiatiques*, vol. II (Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient, vol. XX), Paris 1925, pp. 1-55.

2) Cf. S. Lévi, *Kaniṣka et Śātavāhana*, in *J. As.*, 1936, pp. 63 seq.

lively. This is supported with great weight by the foundation of a monastery for Singhalese monks in Bodh Gaya by king Śrī Meghavarṇa (352-379 A. D.) [1], the Mahābodhivihāra, in which at the time of Hsüan-tsang there lived about one thousand monks [2]. But in Magadha, according to the witness of I-ching, all Buddhist schools were represented, and strongest of all the Mūlasarvāstivādin [3]. Now it has been remarked long ago that the Buddhist literature of Ceylon, and above all the commentaries, show a strong northern influence [4]. It is met with at every step when one scans the pages of the *Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā*. And some legends show unmistakably the form which they have received in the school of the Mūlasarvāstivādin. This finds its natural explanation through the above discussed connection with the home country of Buddhism. We have thus to suppose, after the extinction of the influence of the parent community, a period of close relations of Singhalese Buddhism with Magadha and an influence by the schools of that country. Of course this influence was not marked by the borrowing of whole works, as was earlier the case with the parent community. This was rendered impossible by the difference of the schools and also by the greater independence which in the meantime the Singhalese communities had obtained. There was rather a borrowing of themes, above

[1] Wang Hsüan-ts'ê in TAO SHIH, *Fa yüan chu lin*, T 2122, ch. 29, p. 502 c 13-21; Hsüan-tsang, *Hsi yü chi*, T 2087, ch. 8, p. 918 b 15-c 13; cf. S. LÉVI, *Les missions de Wang Hiuen-ts'e dans l'Inde*, in *J. As.*, 1900, I, pp. 316 seq.

[2] *Hsi yü chi*, T 2087, ch. 8, p. 918 b 14 seq.

[3] *Nan hai chi kuei nei fa chuan*, T 2125, ch. 1, p. 205 b 4 seq.

[4] Cf. S. LÉVI, *L'Apramādavarga*, in *J. As.*, 1912, II, p. 205; ID., *Les Seize Arhats protecteurs de la Loi*, in *J. As.*, 1916, II, pp. 257 sequ.

all in the field of narrative literature, which took place on a large scale.

If we turn now to the indigenous literature of Ceylon, in the earlier period it consisted chiefly of commentaries, and these were compiled in Singhalese only. Nevertheless they too were dependent in the closest manner on the tradition of the mother country. This can be easily understood. Theirs was a literature of free transmission. The canonical texts had already taken a fixed form when they were brought to Ceylon, and they were handed down in this shape. Even the language in which they were composed was maintained. But the oral explanations, which according to old usage were added in a free form with own words to the recitation of the sacred texts, were of course given not in Pāli, but in the local language. A similar proceeding is seen elsewhere. For example the text of the verses in the Jātaka came in a fixed form in Pāli from the mother country to Ceylon. But the pertaining legends were of course recited free in Singhalese [1]. Later these texts too were written down and received a fixed form. But from the point of view of contents, they continued to offer mainly traditions from the mother country. Native lore was included only in the development of the commentaries, in the inserted stories and above all in the chronicles and the church history. And this changed only gradually. When the influence of the schools of Magadha took the place of that of the parent community, this meant only a change of influence, but did not alter

1) This is why the prose text of the Jātaka shows the typical developments and distortions that are characteristic of the free oral tradition. See on this subject the researches of H. Lüders, *Bhārhut und die buddhistische Literatur*, Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XXVI/3, Leipzig 1941.

anything of the dependence itself. And when Pāli was substituted for the Singhalese of the old commentaries and became the only church language, this was only an outward change and was not coupled with great alterations within. In my opinion this change, like the going over to Sanskrit in the mother country, was provoked by the advance in the development of the language [1]. In the first centuries A. D. Singhalese had undergone a deep change. The old works in this language had thereby become difficult to understand, and it was necessary to proceed to a translation, if the Singhalese monks did not wish to be saddled with a second dead literary language on the side of Pāli. This translation could be made in the living language of the people. And indeed there apparently existed a radical current, which was in favour of making the popular tongue the general church language. At least I interpret in this way the information, that just in this period under king Buddhadāsa (388-416) an attempt was made to translate the sacred texts into Singhalese [2]. The second possibility was a translation into the present sacred church language, into Pāli. This was the way that was eventually followed. A decisive reason for this choice seems to have been the fact that works in Pāli could meet with understanding and approval in the mother country, but hardly so works in the Singhalese language. This was a weighty argument, the more so since in that period the flourishing Singhalese communities felt a strong urge to self-assertion. A particularly lively understanding for this we may expect to find with

1) I have briefly expressed my opinion on this subject in my account of the Indian literatures in *Die Weltliteratur*, Vienna 1951, pp. 791 seqq.

2) Cf. *Cūlavamsa*, 37, v. 175.

the Singhalese monks who had dwelt for a period in the Mahābodhivihāra in Magadha. And it is certainly no chance that the leading personality in the translation activity now about to start was Buddhaghosa, a man from Magadha, and that in the prefaces to his commentaries he stresses the point of view of the possibility of being understood in the mother country[1]. But this so important change was, as already said, only external and made no difference to the fact that the Singhalese commentaries only very gradually gained greater independence and separate importance, and that independent works were composed at first only in a limited quantity.

From this situation we can draw the following inferences. In the shape of the old Pāli literature of Ceylon we recognize a great portion of the literature of a community of the home country, which extends over several centuries. It must be studied and treated by itself, free from all Singhalese additions, within the frame of the other Buddhist literature of the mother country and according to the same principles. Of course we must also take due account of the elements from the tradition of the same school which have found their way in the Singhalese commentaries. In the same way we have to pick out the materials borrowed from the literatures of the Northern schools, which must be studied along with the remaining tradition of those schools. On the other side, the study of the Singhalese Buddhist literature must proceed while keeping in touch with the researches on the literature of the home country, and yet separate by itself. Its task is to draw the native elements from these works, to study the

1) Cf. *Samantapāsādikā*, I, p. 2, 7-14.

commentaries not for the sake of the commented works, but in their own right, and to single out in this way everything that Ceylon has accomplished by itself in form and contents. A useful help is tendered by the scanty information of the schools of the mother country on the Tāmraparṇīya, since they show what in the old times was considered in the mother country to be characteristic of the Singhalese schools [1]. Here scholarship stands confronted with grand tasks, which have only just been taken up. But only when they are solved, we shall possess a history of the Singhalese Buddhist literature; a simple account of the tradition is no literary history.

And now a few words on the inferences which we may draw for the valuation of the tradition of the old Pāli works. The works of the mother country composed in Pāli reached Ceylon in the times of Aśoka at the earliest, the greater part of them only later, in all likelihood a long time afterwards. This is rather late in comparison to what we know of the date of the *Skandhaka* work and of the remaining earliest Buddhist literature. Already the missions of Aśoka belong to a period later by more than one hundred years than the composition of the *Skandhaka*. Besides, everything points to the fact that these works came to Ceylon already in a well established form. The late date is in itself an argument in favour. But above all it is difficult to imagine otherwise an oral transmission in a milieu which spoke a foreign language. Some works may even have been brought there in written form. But this carries with itself some consequences of import. H. Oldenberg in the introduction to his edition of the Pāli

[1] Cf. e.g. Ét. Lamotte, *La Somme du Grand Véhicule* (Bibliothèque du Muséon. vol. 7), II, p. 8* seqq.

Vinaya [1] has remarked that in Ceylon later additions were not included in the text of the Pāli works, but in the commentaries. This may be right. But the alterations, from which the Pāli texts were saved in this way, were only such as were usual at the stage of a fixed tradition, viz. essentially alterations of the redactional kind. And accordingly we find in them no mention of Aśoka and no allusion to Ceylon. But just the redactional alterations are the most exterior ones and are therefore the easiest to ascertain for modern criticism. The alterations belonging to the earliest period of the tradition, which subjected the texts to the most serious distortions, had already done their work on the Pāli texts before they came to Ceylon. They are as little free from them as are the texts of the other schools. The history of the tradition, as far as it is now accessible, leads to the same conclusions as the comparison of the various versions of the *Mahāparinirvāṇāsūtra* by E. Waldschmidt [2] has elicited and our comparison of all the *Skandhaka* works has confirmed. The tradition of the old Pāli texts is in so far good, as it shows no corruption like e.g. the Vinaya of the Mahīśāsaka, and was not subjected to later deformations. But they have undergone exactly the same deep-reaching alteration and distortion of the earliest period of the tradition, as the parallel works of the other schools. They are there-

1) Vol. I, p. XLVIII; also *Studien zur Geschichte des buddhistischen Kanons*, Nachrichten von der Königl. Gesellschaft d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, phil-hist. Klasse, 1922, p. 200. The opinion of Oldenberg that the Pāli version perhaps represents the Vinaya in its original form, no more deserves a refutation today, since we can compare the texts of several schools.

2) E. Waldschmidt, *Die Ueberlieferung vom Lebensende des Buddha*, 2. Teil (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, phil.-hist. Klasse, 3. Folge, No. 30), pp. 353 seqq.

fore by no means better transmitted than e.g. the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka, and there is no justification for the opinion that a priori they should be given preference above the works of the other schools.

The Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin

The Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin was partly translated into Chinese in the years 703-710 by I-ching (T 1442-1457). It was also the only Vinaya to be completely translated into Tibetan (bKa'-'gyur, 'Dul-ba, I-XIII). Besides, considerable portions of the Sanskrit original were lately discovered and published. We cannot say anything precise about the structure of this Vinaya in general, because it appears that the several parts on account of their bulk were transmitted separately each for itself. The structure of the *Skandhaka* is the same as with the Sarvāstivādin. Here too the *Bhikṣuṇīvastu* and the *Ācāravastu* are merged with the *Kṣudrakavastu*. I give here the series of the chapters, with the indication which of them have been translated into Chinese.

1. *Pravrajyāvastu* (*Ch'u chia shih*, T 1444, pp. 1020 *b* 11-1040 *a* 21)
2. *Poṣadhavastu*
3. *Pravāraṇāvastu* (*Sui i shih*, T 1446, pp. 1044 *c* 7-1048 *b* 23)
4. *Varṣāvastu* (*An chü shih*, T 1445, pp. 1040 *a* 22-1044 *c* 6)
5. *Carmavastu* (*P'i-ko shih*, T 1447, pp. 1048 *c* 1-1057 *b* 19)

6. *Bhaiṣajyavastu* (*Yao shih*, T 1448, p. 1 *a* 1-97 *a* 24)
7. *Cīvaravastu*
8. *Kaṭhinavastu* (*Chieh-ch'ih--na i shih*, T 1449, pp. 97 *b* 1-99 *a* 13)
9. *Kośāmbakavastu*
10. *Karmavastu*
11. *Pāṇḍulohitakavastu*
12. *Pudgalavastu*
13. *Pārivāsikavastu*
14. *Poṣadhasthāpanavastu*
15. *Śayanāsanavastu*
16. *Śamathavastu*
17. *Saṃghabhedavastu* (*P'o sêng shih*, T 1450, pp. 99 *a* 14-206 *a* 15)
18. *Kṣudrakavastu* (*Tsa shih*, T 1451, pp. 207 *a* 1-414 *b* 19).

The Chinese translation is not only incomplete but also full of gaps. Thus e.g. the *Pravāraṇāvastu* lacks a great portion at the beginning of the legend of Saṃgharakṣita (p. 1035 *b* 7). The *Bhaiṣajyavastu* stops with the Buddhāvadāna (*Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. III, part I, after p. 218), the rest is missing. Also the *Saṃghabhedavastu* stops abruptly in the middle of the *Śrāmaṇyaphalasūtra*. The end of the legend of Devadatta (pp. 147 *c* 1-155 *b* 9) has found its way in the middle of the account of the Buddha's visit in Kapilavastu. The Chinese translation is also much less exact than the Tibetan one.

As to the nature of the tradition in this Vinaya, the picture is dominated by the large quantity of tales. The old tales and legends are told in great detail, new ones are added, and above all stories from former births are

again and again introduced to explain the events. In spite of this, the old Vinaya tradition determines the structure of the work and forms its skeleton. In many chapters, in which the tales occupy not too much space, it is well preserved, above all in the chapters on the punishment procedures (11. *Pāṇḍulohitakavastu*, 12. *Pudgalavastu* and 13. *Pārivāsikavastu*). In some other chapters the tales have grown to such a luxuriant richness, that the Vinaya tradition is nearly choked by them and seems so to speak intercalated only in isolated passages (e.g. 6. *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, 17. *Saṃghabhedavastu* and 18. *Kṣudrakavastu*). The state of preservation of the tradition is not very good; it has seriously suffered and has undergone many distortions. The bye-sections are often lost, and what is extant shows in its re-modelling new characteristics of its own.

The biography of the Buddha in the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin deserves a special mention. The accounts of the birth and young age of the Buddha and of his demise, which formed the frame of the old *Skandhaka* work, are joined together in the two last chapters, so that together they form a complete biography. This may give rise to the impression that this school has carried on and completed the incomplete biographies, which we find transmitted in the other schools as independent works [1]. But this is not true, at least not in this form. On this point the Mūlasarvāstivādin from the beginning have entered upon a path different from the other schools. The other schools have detached the account of the young age of the Buddha and the beginnings of his teaching activity from the context of the Vinaya and have made it

[1] See above pp. 49 seqq. and cf. ÉT. LAMOTTE, *La légende du Buddha*, (in *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 134, 1947-48, pp. 37-71), pp. 61 seqq.

into an independent work. As they included the account of his death as *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* in the Sūtrapiṭaka, these works remained incomplete. On the contrary, the Mūlasarvāstivādin have never taken these sections out of the frame of the Vinaya, but have joined them into a unity within the Vinaya. The reason for this must have been the fact that the enormous increase in bulk of this Vinaya had broken up the frame originally represented by the biography, and that the single portions were no more felt to be the connecting link which held together this gigantic work. The piecing together seems to have taken place as follows. As seen above (p. 116 seqq.), the Devadatta legend in the *Saṃghabhedavastu* had early expanded with a luxuriant growth and had become a bulky narrative. Thus it could serve as a sort of crystallization point for further development. First of all the first portion of the biography from the beginning of the *Pravrajyāvastu* was attached to it. In this way there resulted a long account, which expatiated from the earliest beginnings to late into the period of the teaching activity of the Buddha. The last portion had of course to be formed by the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* at the end of the *Skandhaka*. And therefore the *Saṃghabhedavastu* was shifted in order to be as near as possible to it [1]. Lastly, the remaining interval was filled in with other suitable legends: the destruction of the Śākya by Virūḍhaka (T 1451, pp. 234 *a* 12-244 *a* 21), the *Prātihāryasūtra* (pp. 329 *a* 5-333 *c* 13), the stay of the Buddha in the heaven of the 33 gods and the story of the nun Utpalavarṇā (pp. 345 *c* 19-350 *b* 6), the *Ambaṭṭhasutta* (pp. 378 *b* 4-380 *b* 10) etc. Even the cycle

[1] The transposition and partial condensation of the closing chapters of the *Skandhaka* seem to have taken place in this connection.

of legends around the kings Udayana, Caṇḍapradyota and the saint Mahākātyāyana was completely taken over (pp. 297 *b* 7-324 *c* 11). The net result was an enormous connected account, which covers the whole life of the Buddha and in which the remnants of the old Vinaya appear to be dispersed as scattered fragments [1].

The Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika

The Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika (*Mo-ho-sêng-ch'i lü*, T 1425) is based on a manuscript brought by the pilgrim Fa-hsien from Pāṭaliputra and translated into Chinese about 416 by Fa-hsien himself together with Buddhabhadra. It consists of:

1. *Bhikṣuvibhaṅga* (pp. 227-412)
2. *Skandhaka* (pp. 412-514)
3. *Bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga* (pp. 514-548)

The structure of the *Vibhaṅga*, being conditioned by the Prātimokṣa, is similar to the other Vinaya. The case of the *Skandhaka* is different. These show a structure quite different from that of the related works, owing to the process sketched below.

The old *Skandhaka* work was conceived and executed according to a great and well thought of plan, but its structure was much more artistic than systematic. In view of the conditions of tradition in the early period,

[1] A special study of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin from the point of view of its composition and gradual development is very promising of interesting results.

this was bound to have evil results. The framework narrative as connecting link was, owing to the great bulk of the work, diluted in too great a space for being able to accomplish its task. Thus it came to the crumbling-away process which we have studied in the 3rd chapter. The scope of many legends was no longer understood. They became ineffective and lost their significance for the structure of the text. The more bulky groups of regulations were mixed together in the course of oral transmission. And thus eventually the work offered on wide stretches the aspect of a badly arranged collection of materials, as we can see from the extant versions. Under these circumstances the temptation was very strong to try and put a new arrangement in the place of the old one, which was no longer understood; and the Mahāsāṃghika have made this attempt. They tried to substitute for the old artistic shaping of the materials a new purely systematic arrangement. This attempt, however, succeeded only in part.

In the first place the original coverings of the work were completely discarded and the material was arranged simply into paragraphs. This was in keeping with the Indian bent for systematic subdivisions. In many instances it was easy to carry it out, specially in the sections treating of the law of the community. Occasionally the exposition became thereby more regular and clearer, and several complements could be added to the original work. Minor sections were rendered more evident by putting at their head a summary of the points discussed. Sometimes also the form of a short comprehensive definition was chosen, the explanation of this definition being given by the following section. But this method could be employed

without difficulty only with a part of the material. A good deal remained impervious to a clear subdivision. And then fragments of the old text remained intact without essential changes. Eventually the whole re-arrangement resulted into a loose piecing together of a mass of rules of the most various sorts.

I am going to demonstrate this procedure on a lengthy section from the first pages of the work. First I shall give a general table.

1.	*Shou chü chü*	pp. 412 *b* 21-422 *a*	6	=	1. *Pravrajyāvastu*
2.	*Chieh-mo chieh-mo shih*	pp. 422 *a* 8-422 *c*	28		10. *Karmavastu*
3.	*Chih fu chieh-mo etc.*	pp. 422 *c* 28-428 *b*	10	=	11. *Pāṇḍulohitakavastu*
4.	*Tsui wu tsui, fu pu fa etc.*	pp. 428 *b* 11-438 *b*	29	=	12. *Pudgalavastu* and 13. *Pārivāsikavastu*
5.	*Ying chieh-mo pu ying chieh mo etc.*	pp. 438 *b* 29-443 *c*	4	.	(*sundry*)
6.	*Yüan t'ien fa etc.*	pp. 443 *c* 4-446 *c*	3	=	17. *Śayanāsanavastu*
7.	*Po sa fa*	pp. 446 *c* 7-450 *c*	2	=	2. *Poṣadhavastu*
8.	*An chü fa*	pp. 450 *c* 2-451 *a*	6	=	3. *Varṣāvastu*
9.	*Tzŭ tsŭ fa*	pp. 451 *a* 6-452 *a*	1		4. *Pravāraṇāvastu*
10.	*Chia-ch'ih-na i fa*	pp. 452 *a* 7-453 *b*	5	=	8. *Kaṭhinavastu*
11.	*I fa*	pp. 453 *b* 5-455 *a*	20	=	7. *Cīvaravastu*
12.	*Ping pi-ch'iu*	pp. 455 *a* 25-456 *a*	22	=	»
13.	*K'an ping pi-ch'iu*	pp. 456 *a* 22-457 *b*	3		»
14.	*Yao fa*	pp. 457 *b* 3-457 *b*	23	=	6. *Bhaiṣajyavastu*
15.	*Ho shang a-chih-li kung hsing ti tzŭ i chih ti tzŭ fa*	pp. 457 *b* 23-460 *b*	22	. .	1. *Pravrajyāvastu*
16.	*Sha-mi fa*	pp. 460 *b* 22-461 *b*	19		»
17.	*Po fa*	pp. 461 *b* 19-462 *c*	5	=	19. *Kṣudrakavastu*
	etc. etc.				

At the beginning stands, as in all the versions of the *Skandhaka*, the *Pravrajyāvastu*, but it is divided up in accordance with its composite contents. Here at first the admission to the order is alone treated (§ 1). Everything concerning the relations between teachers and pupils is relegated to another place (§§ 15-16). Four kinds of

admission to the order are distinguished: admission by himself, by the words "Come, monk!", by an assembly of 10 monks and by an assembly of 5 monks. The execution shows that it is a purely external subdivision which is forced upon the subject. For the admission by himself, reference is made to the story of the Buddha, whom alone this mode of admission concerns (p. 412 *b* 24-26). For the admission by the words: "Come, monk!", we are told how the Buddha allows his disciples to admit monks in this fashion and how this leads to unsatisfactory results (pp. 412 *b* 26-413 *a* 4). This is merely a preface to the institution of the admission by an assembly of 10 monks, which the Buddha introduces on the ground of this experience. Only this is treated in detail (pp. 413 *a* 4-415 *a* 28), by inserting here the whole description of the procedure of admission, which in the other versions stands at the end of the *Pravrajyāvastu* (see above p. 73) While speaking of the admission by an assembly of 5 monks (pp. 415 *a* 28-416 *a* 23), the text tells the story of Śroṇa Koṭikarṇa [1], which in the other versions belongs to the Carmavastu (see above p. 88). In this connection we may mention that the tendency towards schematic arangement is observable even in the details of this section. On each one of the 4 bases of monastic life (*niśraya*), which are discussed in connection with the admission procedure, there is a separate tale of how the unseemly behaviour of a monk gives origin to its introduction, and how the complaints of newly admitted monks give motive to the regulation that the 4 bases are to be explained to them before admission (pp. 413 *c* 12-414 *c* 7).

[1] It is here connected with the legend of the conversion of Anāthapiṇḍada and of the foundation of the Jetavana from the *Śayanāsanavastu*.

Now there follows a short section dealing with cases in which the admission is valid or invalid (p. 416 *a* 23-*b* 26). Here a number of minor regulations are loosely pieced together. We must remark that among these regulations there are some which in the other versions are preserved only in isolated instances (e.g. p. 416 *b* 13 seqq. = Dh: p. 814 *b* 20 seqq.; p. 416 *b* 19 seqq. = Dh: p. 813 *c* 24 seqq.).

Next comes the treatment of the cases, in which admission to the order is prohibited (pp. 416 *b* 26-422 *a* 8). These cases are to be reckoned among the main sections and are therefore well preserved here as in the other versions. A portion of them appears as a group already in the other versions (see above pp. 77 seq.). Here all similar cases are, moreover, joined with this group into a unity. At the beginning we find a list of them (p. 416 *b* 26-*c* 2) and then without further connection there follow in a long series the discussions of the several cases. In this section too the bent for schematic enumerations is characteristically apparent; such is the case with the enumeration of the various bodily defects which debar from admission to the order (p. 418 *b* 14 seqq.), and above all in the distinction of 4 kinds of ministers (p. 420 *a* 12 seqq.), 3 kinds of children (p. 421 *b* 11 seqq.), 5 kinds of slaves (p. 421 *c* 5 etc.) and so on.

The *Pravrajyāvastu*, the admission to the order, is immediately followed by the exposition of the community law. Its treatment is very characteristic. The purely narrative *Kośāmbakavastu* has disappeared with the exception of a few scanty traces [1], and the fundamental *Kar-*

[1] pp. 439 *b* 22-*c* 24 and p. 440 *b* 26-*c* 19; cf. above p. 105.

mavastu is placed at the head (§ 2). But it too is characteristically modified. The introductory narrative is left out. The material itself is divided into community procedures (*chieh–mo*) and objects of the community procedures (*chieh–mo shih*). Both are preceded by introductory enumerations (p. 422 *a* 14-18 and *b* 22-27). The enumeration of the community procedures lists the various kinds, which we find mentioned also in the other versions: four classes of community procedures, according as the assembly is complete and the proceedings lawful or not; four classes of community procedures according to the legal number of the monks (see above p. 106 seq.). But also other subdivisions are brought forward. Thus the text distinguishes between community proceedings in which the proposal must be subjected to a triple interrogation to the community (*jñapticaturtha karma*), and proceedings in which a single interrogation is sufficient. Then all these classes are briefly explained. The objects of the community proceedings are similarly dealt with.

The next section is, as in most versions, the *Pāṇḍulohitakavastu* (§ 3). Here a clear subdivision was found already in the old *Skandhaka* work through the distinction of five chief procedures of punishment. And yet even here we find peculiar alterations. In the old *Skandhaka* work a particular incident was narrated in each case and in connection with it there was an account of the introduction of the relevant punishment procedure. Here the several procedures are enumerated in their order and justified by a series of instances. Occasionally these instances are preceded by a short list, as in the case of the *pratisaṃharaṇīya karma* (p. 425 *a* 10 seq.), or a pu-

nishment procedure is divided into several sub-classes, as the *tarjanīya karma* (p. 423 *a* 1-5).

Now the *Pudgalavastu* and *Pārivāsikavastu* ought to have followed (§ 4), but in their case a clear subdivision presented difficulties. Thus a rather peculiar method was adopted. After a brief treatment of a case belonging to the *Pudgalavastu* (p. 428 *b* 11-29), we are told what a monk proficient in the Vinaya should know in order to absolve another from an offence (p. 428 *c* 1-17). And now a lot of various things connected herewith are treated in the order of this enumeration: who is to be considered as proficient in the Vinaya (pp. 428 *c* 17-429 *a* 22), offence and non-offence (pp. 429 *a* 22-431 *c* 28), concealment and non-concealment (pp. 431 *c* 29-432 *b* 24), confession and non-confession of an offence (p. 432 *b* 15-*c* 7), when a probation period should or should not be imposed (p. 432 *c* 8-14), when it is lawfully imposed (p. 432 *c* 14-20) and lawfully carried out (p. 432 *c* 20-26) etc. etc. The conclusion of this section is formed by a comprehensive summary of the proceedings while imposing the probation period (*parivāsa*), imposing the *mānāpya* and extinguishing the punishment (*āvarhana*) (pp. 436 *b* 21-438 *b* 29).

The next section (§ 5) explains, loosely arranged, a number of cases, which had not up to that point found a place in the exposition of the community law. Firstly, as an addendum to the *Karmavastu*, the fourfold division of the community procedures is again discussed, according as the assembly is complete or not and the proceeding is lawful or not (pp. 438 *b* 29-439 *a* 5). Then follow instructions on the remission of the punishments discussed in the *Pāṇḍulohitakavastu* and the *Pudgalavastu* (p. 439 *a* 5-*b* 22). Two further passages elaborate in peculiar fashion

the more important contents of the *Kośāmbakavastu* on community law (pp. 439 *b* 22-440 *b* 25 and pp. 440 *b* 25-441 *a* 26). Then we find regulations about what should happen to a monk who is guilty of a Pārājika offence, but does not want to quit the community (p. 441 *a* 26-*c* 7). A piece from the *Śamathavastu* comes next (pp. 441 *c* 7-442 *a* 11) etc. etc.

Instructions on the use of estates belonging to the community and on the construction of buildings lead up to a section, which finds its counterpart in the *Śayanāsanavastu* of the other versions (§ 6). We find next some sections similar to the chapters which in the other versions follow the *Pravrajyāvastu*, viz. a *Poṣadhavastu* (§ 7), a *Varṣāvastu* (§ 8), a *Pravāraṇāvastu* (§ 9), a *Kaṭhinavastu* (§ 10), a *Cīvaravastu* (§§ 11-13) and a *Bhaiṣajyavastu* (§ 14). Here we find also the paragraphs on the duties of master and disciple, teacher and pupil (§ 15) and the instructions about the novices (§ 16), which usually stand in the *Pravrajyāvastu*. These sections too show again and again the modifications that are characteristic of this Vinaya, as e. g. in the *Kaṭhinavastu* the exposition of the procedure in the shape of a definition and explanation of the same (p. 452 *a* 15-*b* 2), or the dissolution of the different components of the *Cīvaravastu* into independent paragraphs (§§ 11-13).

In this way a good deal of the chapters of the old *Skandhaka* work is reproduced. But at the same time the large connected sections are at an end, and the method of arranging the materials followed by this Vinaya leads now to a long series of isolated rules, which are only now and then separated by larger groups. We find firstly a number of rules from the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* (pp. 462 *c* 5-

464 *c* 2). Under the title *Fei chieh–mo* (false procedure) a great group of the most various tales is gathered together (pp. 464 c 7-470 c 20). Then there follow in disorder pieces from the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, *Kṣudrakavastu*, *Śayanāsanavastu*, *Cīvaravastu*, *Carmavastu* etc., until every apparent order fades away.

I think the above suffices to give an idea of the quality and structure of this Vinaya. But in spite of all these alterations and reshufflings it does not deny its origin from the same source as the other Vinaya works we have treated. Not only a great portion of the material is the same inspite of all the additions, but the material shows clearly the form which the old *Skandhaka* work had impressed upon it. I refer e.g. to the introductory narrative of the *Poṣadhasthāpanavastu*, which the author of the *Skandhaka* has created by re-shaping the *Asurasūtra* (see above pp. 148 seq.) and which appears here in the same altered form (p. 447 *b* 11-*c* 2). Further, in the arrangement of the material we meet with striking coincidences. Thus the peculiar connection of the rules for the care of the sick with the rules for the clothing of the monks in the *Cīvaravastu* is here maintained in spite of the several sections having become independent (§§ 11-13). The regulations on seniority, which in the other versions are found in the *Śayanāsanavastu*, are connected also in this case with pieces from the *Śayanāsanavastu* (pp. 443 c 4-445 *c* 22 and 445 *c* 22-446 *c* 3). To all this we may add also the remnants of the framework narrative with its characteristic arrangement, which attaches the accounts of the councils to the narrative of the death of the Buddha and inserts the list of teachers between the two accounts of the councils (see above pp. 55 seqq.). With this the proof

may be considered as reached, and we are entitled to assume that also the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika goes back to the old *Skandhaka* work and that its different appearance is merely due to a later re-shaping [1].

[1] It is noteworthy that the *Vibhaṅga* (p. 334 c 26 seqq.) utilizes the beginning of the *Kośāmbakavastu*, which had been left out during the re-modelling of the *Skandhaka* work. It implies therefore the work as still being preserved in its early form.

ADDITIONAL REMARK

Since the present work was finished some valuable works have appeared in print, especially the book of A. Bareau, *Les sectes bouddhiques* Saigon 1955. But as far as I can see the results obtained by me are not affected by it.

Lastly, I make use of this opportunity to thank Prof. L. Petech, who has undertaken the tiresome task of translating this work, which was written originally in German, into English.

INDEX

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRINTED IN ROME
BY
DR. GIOVANNI BARDI
TIPOGRAFIA DEL SENATO
SALITA DE' CRESCENZI 16 - ROME
1956

The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature
E. Frauwallner
IsMEO, Roma, 1956

Serie Orientale Roma, VIII
ISBN – 978-88-6323-007-9

Riproduzione in digitale a cura di **IsIAO MediaStore**
www.mediastore.isiao.it   bookshop@isiao.it

© 2010 – Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente, Roma